

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181	
Stage 1 - Sift							
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++) 0.39ha	(++) 0.91ha	(++)0.43ha	(++) 2.83ha	(++)1.1ha	
	Less than 0.15 Ha --						
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy (SP1)	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(--) employment use	(++)	(++) mixed	(++)	(++)	
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --						
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further	Will Not cause harm ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Will cause harm --						
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --						
Stage 2 - Site Assessment							
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(+)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(+)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Local Shop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(--) In Swinton	(--) In Swinton	(--) In Swinton	(--) In Swinton	(--) In Swinton
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(--)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					
	Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +					
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -					
		15 minutes walking time and over --					

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++	(+)	(++)	(-)	(++)	(+)
	Site has good accessibility +					
	Site has variable accessibility –					
	Site has poor accessibility --					
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2 +					
	Flood zone 3a –					
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2					
	Flood Zone 3a					
	Less vulnerable ++					
	More vulnerable +					
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++					
	No --	(--) SFRA complete but FRA may be required in respect of surface water	(--) SFRA complete but FRA may be required. Site submission material indicates that a FRA will be submitted with the planning application. The surface water drainage will need to be considered due to the presence of the principal aquifer on a small part of the site.	(--) SFRA complete but FRA may be required in respect of surface water	(--) SFRA complete but FRA will be required as >1ha	(--) SFRA complete but FRA will be required as >1ha
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +					
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated –					
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --					
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and Highways England (HE) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(+) County Highways have considered: Acceptable access onto Amotherby Lane, impact on highway network will need to be determined by a Traffic Assessment. Consider with site 8	(+) County Highways have considered: Acceptable access onto Amotherby Lane, impact on highway network will need to be determined by Traffic Assessment. Consider with site 3. Could be possible conflicts with existing factory traffic. Access feasibility study submitted by the adjacent landowner (site 3) for consideration of a wider access. (Not confirmed by submitter of this site). The site submission has provided an indicative access scheme, but it is not provided in sufficient	(+) County Highways have considered: Acceptable onto Malton Road. Minor works may be required to extend existing footway/street lighting to serve the site. Need to consider cumulative impact.	(+) County Highways have considered: Access onto the B1257 could be achieved, however the location of the access must be carefully located to ensure appropriate visibility can be achieved. There are no footpaths on the frontage of the	(+) County Highways have considered: Acceptable onto Amotherby Lane. Both a Travel Plan and Traffic Impact Assessment required to assess impact. Possible conflict with factory traffic on other side. Consider cumulative impacts
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +					
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -					

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --		indicative access scheme, but it is not provided in sufficient detail.		footpaths on the frontage of the site, this would also need considering as part of any proposed work, there could be a considerable amount of work required to achieve this. The access near the school could be used as an emergency and pedestrian link only. The Site Submitter has now produced two schemes for the site, the access remains unchanged in either submission.	Consider cumulative impacts.
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity						
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	<div style="background-color: #92d050; padding: 2px;">Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++</div> <div style="background-color: #d9ead3; padding: 2px;">Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</div> <div style="background-color: #f4cccc; padding: 2px;">Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</div> <div style="background-color: red; color: white; padding: 2px;">Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --</div>	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species. The site has been assessed against the Natural England (NE) Impact Risk Zones. For residential schemes over 50 units automatic requirement to consult NE. However, NE has been consulted.	(+) currently a derelict house and garage. It is probable that protected species may be present. If there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species.	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species. The site has been assessed against the Natural England (NE) Impact Risk Zones. For residential schemes over 50 units automatic requirement to consult NE. However, NE has been consulted.	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	<p>Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++</p> <p>Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --</p>	No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.	(+) Currently a greenfield site, with established hedgerows. Currently garden area and paddocks. A scheme submitted has increased the presence of hedgerows.	No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.	No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.	No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	<p>Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++</p> <p>Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</p> <p>Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--</p>	(+) No information has been submitted concerning the impact on trees and hedgerows. The Council's Tree Officer has made the following recommendations: Retain all existing boundary trees and shrubs in accordance with BS 5837:2005 and ensure that the layout of the development does not compromise their long-term retention. Provide high quality landscaping for the development including small to medium sized tree species. Augment the eastern boundary of the site with a new native hedge.	(+) As scheme submitted has shown that the existing hedgerows would be removed, but this could be mitigated through new hedgerows. Potentially a net gain. No impacts on trees.	(+) No information has been submitted concerning the impact on trees and hedgerows. The site has trees, and mature hedgerows, but the site is previously developed, a scheme of redevelopment would need to retain those trees and boundary features which contribute to the character of the area.	(+) No information has been submitted. The Council's Tree Officer considers: Apart from the northern boundary, the site is well screened by existing vegetation which should be retained, managed and enhanced appropriately to provide long-term screening of the development. Summary of landscape criteria for site No.148: Retain boundary vegetation, and trees subject to BS 5837:2012 survey requirements; Retain the alignment of the existing public right of way, include it within open space allocation, and enhance with an avenue of large mature native trees; and provide high quality landscaping for the development including small to medium sized trees and a small number of larger species where space permits in larger gardens. Properties along the road frontage should provide front gardens large enough to accommodate large trees to perpetuate the prevailing landscape character of road frontages throughout that part of the village along the B1257. The two schemes show that the hedge is to be realigned. With supplemental planting on the eastern and western boundary.	(+) No information has been submitted. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer recommends the following: The existing eastern boundary being gapped up and supplemented with a further row of hedge plants and native trees, including some larger native species including oak, and ash; Consider under grounding overhead lines to accommodate new planting; Establish a wide (three rows of plants) natural edge along northern boundary capable of screening views from the northern approach, including a number of randomly spaced trees of reasonably light canopy to form a natural end stop to the village. Selecting species that will not cause undue shading to adjacent properties, including field maple, wild plum, and wild crab. Include a few small species trees along site frontages to soften development. Ensure a high standard of landscaping internally within the development.

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity'	Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
	Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +					
	Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation -					
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --					
C Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting						
Q8 What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments which cover the Ryedale Area and Special Qualities Study (including views and open spaces)?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++	(+) The village of Amotherby is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. This site is within the flatter vale land, and is formed from a series of paddocks, developments to the north and south have physically and visually enclosed this land, although wider views of it would be achievable from the east. As such it is considered that this site may be accommodated within the landscape, subject to boundary treatment considerations. However, in terms of the character of this site, its rural, pastoral qualities would be lost through development; harming the character of the settlement.	(-) The village of Amotherby is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. This site is within the flatter vale land, and is formed from a series of paddocks, developments to the north and south have physically and visually enclosed this land, although wider views of it would be achievable from the east. As such it is considered that this site may be accommodated within the landscape, subject to boundary treatment considerations. However, in terms of the character of this site, its rural, pastoral qualities would be lost through development; harming the character of the settlement.	(++) Being to the north of the B1257 this site is adjacent to the Howardian Hills National Character Area, this site is within the built up area of the village, and is a Brownfield frontage plot which has a dilapidated dwelling and former garage. Significant potential to improve the appearance of this site, which would contribute to the character and appearance of the settlement.	(+)The village of Amotherby is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. This site is demonstrative of this landscape type, with grazed, gently sloping land, bounded by hedgerows. To the north the school site projects out from the village to enclose the land from the north, the site would be open at the south and west, but there is sizable, established hedgerows. It is a substantial site, relative to the existing settlement.	(+)The village of Amotherby is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. Being at the northernmost extent of the village, this site follows on from modern residential development on a flat, open site, and would be perpetuating the linear formation of the settlement. As such it is considered that the landscape form could accommodate development in principle.
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +					
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved -					
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --					

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
Q8. What impact would the site have on the nationally designated landscapes of the North York Moors National Park and Howardian Hills AONB?	<p>Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++</p> <p>Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +</p> <p>Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –</p> <p>Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --</p>	(++) The site is not proximal to the National Park, and by virtue of the site's topography and situation, being located to the north of the village it is not considered that the development of this site would harm the Howardian Hills AONB.	(+) The site is not proximal to the National Park. The site is on the eastern edge of the village, and is unlikely to adversely affect the setting of the AONB by virtue of its scale, the topography and screening afforded by other development which has already occurred.	(++) The site is not proximal to the National Park. The site is a derelict Brownfield site, with appropriate development there is potential to enhance the setting of the AONB.	(-) Site is adjacent to the AONB, the road being the demarcation. The land rises to the south, and continues to rise beyond the road, and this may need consideration, as it means that development has the potential to affect the setting of the AONB, particularly in respect of views from the AONB. The site is not proximal to the National Park. Given the presence of the school, development has extended out, and the scale, design, massing and landscaping will be important to ensure that any scheme complements the setting of the AONB.	(+) As this one of the northernmost sites proposed, it is considered in combination with the lower, flatter, topography that it would not detract from the Howardian Hills AONB. The site is not proximal to the National Park, and is on low-lying, flat land.
Q10 Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features to minimise its impact or provide adequate landscape mitigation measures?	<p>Site is capable of retaining and enhancing existing landscape features ++</p> <p>Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +</p> <p>Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed –</p>	(+) No information has been submitted concerning landscape mitigation measures. Although it is expected hedgerows will be retained.	(-) The submitted materials refer to established landscaping, but more from a residential amenity perspective, with BATA being proximal. There is a need to consider the impact of landscaping on the setting of the listed Church.	(++) No details have been submitted concerning the landscaping, although there is no reason to suggest that appropriate landscaping could not be achievable.	(-) No details have been submitted as to any landscape scheme. The land rises to the south, and this may need consideration, in terms of treatment of the topography. It is a relatively substantial site. There is an expectation that the established hedgerows would be retained.	(+) No details have been submitted concerning the landscaping, although given the topography it is likely that mitigation could be achieved by retention of the established hedging in the first instance.

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	Development within the built form of the settlement ++	(+)/Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. The site is to the north eastern edge of Amotherby, would be contained within the existing built extent.	(+). Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. Amotherby and Swinton are proximal, but this site is unlikely to enhance coalescence, because it is set down the hill, and is within a paddock area, and there are a number of fields between the settlements at this location.	(++). The site is within the built up area.	(+). Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. On the western side of Amotherby, there is a considerable distance between Amotherby and Appleton -le-Street.	(+). Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. This site is to the northern end of the village, on the western side, and so would not enhance any sense of coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton.
	Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement +					
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible –					
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible --					
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++	(+)	(+)	(++)	(+)	(+)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +					
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –					
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --					
Culture and Heritage						
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(+). The site is within the Listed Building buffer zone of the collection of Amotherby's Listed Buildings: the Church, St. Helens House and the Old Vicarage. But it is considered by virtue of distance, boundary treatments, the setting of these designated assets would be preserved.	(-). The site extends close to the Listed Church, there is a concern that the setting and the experience of the church and church yard has potential to be harmed by the presence of development in this location. The submitted scheme outlines an established treed boundary to the southern boundary of the site. The setting of the other two Listed buildings would not be affected. Historic England require an assessment of what contribution this currently- undeveloped area makes to those elements which contribute to the significance of this listed building and what effect the development of this site would have upon those significances. There is a grade II Listed	(+). The site is within the Listed Building buffer zone of the collection of Amotherby Listed Buildings: the Church, St. Helens House and the Old Vicarage. But it is considered by virtue of distance, boundary treatments, the setting of these designated assets would be preserved.	(+). The site is within the Listed Building buffer zone of the collection of Amotherby Listed Buildings: the Church, St. Helens House and the Old Vicarage. But it is considered by virtue of distance, boundary treatments, the setting of these designated assets would be preserved.	(+). The site is within the Listed Building buffer zone of the collection of Amotherby Listed Buildings: the Church, St. Helens House and the Old Vicarage. But it is considered by virtue of distance, boundary treatments, the setting of these designated assets would be preserved.
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +					
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –					

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --		Milepost which is about 20 metres from the proposed junction. The junction would not affect the significance of the Milepost.			

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
Q13 Will the site affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(+) Site's location and size mean that it is unlikely to harm the wider settlement character of Amotherby.	(-) Existing dwelling is not listed. It is an attractive farm house which contributes to the street scene. Concerns around the loss of the pastoral, rural qualities on the wider character of Amotherby. NYCC Heritage Unit have identified: Potential for Roman roadside settlement and activity, as well as medieval remains, in this vicinity. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching.	(++) currently a dilapidated garage and house. Although no firm details have been submitted, a scheme could improve this side of the entrance to the village. NYCC Heritage unit advise: Site lies within an area of potential archaeological interest within Amotherby village. There is potential for Roman roadside settlement and activity to extend beneath the site of the present village, where remains of later, medieval settlement may also survive. Whilst the former use of parts of the application site as a garage and depot may have disturbed any archaeological features, due to size of the site, & existing buildings present, a condition to secure a programme of archaeological mitigation is advised.	(+) Site's location and size mean that it is unlikely to harm the wider settlement character of Amotherby. NYCC Heritage Unit have advised: this site has projected course of Roman road between Malton and Hovingham running through it. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.	(+) Site's location and size mean that it is unlikely to harm the wider settlement character of Amotherby.
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +					
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –					
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --					
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(+) Site's location and size mean that it is unlikely to harm the wider settlement character of Amotherby.	(-)Subject to archaeological investigation, and a Statement of Significance for the impact on the Church of St. Helen	(++)Subject to archaeological investigation	(+)Subject to archaeological investigation	(+) Site's location and size mean that it is unlikely to harm the wider settlement character of Amotherby.
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +					
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –					
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --					
Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy						
Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?	Site capable and developer willing++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.
	Site capable but developer unwilling -					
	Site not capable --					

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.
Q16 Can the site link in to existing heat or power sources available in the District?	Site capable of linking in with existing heat or power source and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.
E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy'	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -					
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --					
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction						
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.
	Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit -					
	Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --					
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction -					
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes +	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.
	No -					
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -					
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --					
Efficient Use of Land						
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++	0.39ha of Greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	0.91ha of Greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	++	2.83ha of Greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	1.1ha of Greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +					

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	<p>Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++</p> <p>Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +</p> <p>Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -</p> <p>Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --</p>	Not residential.	(-) Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 19 dwellings. The indicative site submission has proposed 40 units, which is twice that which the Council consider is reasonable for the build context of the area.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 9 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 59 dwellings. However, the two site proposals have produced schemes for c.44/45 units, in conjunction with land for car parking for the school, and in one submission-open space, the other a village hall with tennis court	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 21 dwellings.
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	<p>Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++</p> <p>Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +</p> <p>Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -</p> <p>Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --</p>	No evidence of land contamination.	No evidence of land contamination.	(-) This is a former garage and the legacy of the garage workings, and the PFS will need addressing. No proposals (at this stage) which have been submitted make reference to the remediation necessary.	No evidence of land contamination.	No evidence of land contamination.
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	<p>Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++</p> <p>Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +</p> <p>Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -</p> <p>Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --</p>	(+)	(+) but consider that proposal represents a density which does not reflect the context of the surrounding built form.	(-)	(+)	(+)
Natural Resources						
Q. 23 Would the development of this site involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)?	<p>No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++</p> <p>Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -</p> <p>More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --</p>	(-) 0.39ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site is currently a grazed paddock which is less than 5ha in size.	(-) 1.91ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The site is series of grazed paddocks, and is less than 5ha in size.	(++)	(-) 2.83ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is grazed.	(-) 1.1ha of land at Grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is cropped.
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	<p>Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?</p> <p>Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone -?</p> <p>Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --</p>	(++)	(++)	(-) within a mineral safeguarding area but adjacent to settlement	(-) within a mineral safeguarding area but adjacent to settlement	(++)

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
<p>Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?</p>	<p>Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++</p> <p>Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -</p> <p>Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --</p>	<p>No response requested from the Environment Agency.</p>	<p>(-) Most of the site is located on an Unproductive Aquifer, with a small area of the site on the Principal Aquifer. Not in a Groundwater Source Protection Zone. The geology underlying most of the site is the Amptill Clay & Kimmeridge Clay formations. The southern part of the site is underlain by the Lower Calcareous Grit Formation which is a member of the Corallian Group principal aquifer.</p> <p>There is a licensed groundwater abstraction approximately 0.55km to the southeast of the site and the water is for use in a food manufacturing environment which may be particularly sensitive to pollution.</p> <p>The geology across all but the southern portion of the site is not suitable for use as an aquifer due to its low permeability. However, the solid geology is overlain by permeable drift deposits and in developing the site it should be considered that any pollution entering the drift may migrate toward the principal aquifer to the south. The southern part of the site is much more vulnerable to pollution and this should be considered as part of any development at this location, particularly given the proximity of the nearby groundwater abstraction.</p> <p>Hydrogeological Risk Assessment will be required.</p>	<p>No response requested from the Environment Agency.</p>	<p>(-)The northern part of the site is underlain by the Lower Calcareous Grit Formation and the southern part is underlain by the Coralline Oolite Formation, both members of the Corallian Group principal aquifer. The solid geology of northern part of the site is overlain by permeable superficial drift deposits of sand & gravel. The southern part of the site has no superficial drift.</p> <p>There is a licensed groundwater abstraction approximately 0.6km to the southeast of the site and the water is for use in a food manufacturing environment which may be particularly sensitive to pollution.</p> <p>Groundwater is highly vulnerable to contamination at this location. Consideration should be given to preventing pollution entering the groundwater environment, as a result of any development at the site, particularly given the proximity of the nearby groundwater abstraction.</p> <p>Hydrogeological Risk Assessment will be required.</p>	<p>No response requested from the Environment Agency.</p>
<p>Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?</p>	<p>Land has no instability concerns ++</p> <p>Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +</p> <p>Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out -</p>	<p>No evidence of land instability.</p>	<p>No evidence of land instability.</p>	<p>No evidence of land instability.</p>	<p>No evidence of land instability. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.</p>	<p>No evidence of land instability.</p>

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
	Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --					
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	<p>HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++</p> <p>HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"</p>	Amotherby has BATA which is a major hazard site. Employment use	(++)	(++)	(++)	(--) HSE inner zone and level 2 sensitivity site

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	<p>Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++</p> <p>Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +</p> <p>Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --</p>	(-)	(-) Will need a Hydrogeological Assessment to mitigate risk	(-)	(-) Will need a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment to mitigate risk	(-) Due to HSE assessment
Amenity						
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible –</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(+) This is an employment site, adjacent to an established employment site. Uses are likely to complementary. This could change if the land to the south is developed for housing.	(-) Adverse noise levels. It maybe that the developers may wish to reassess the extent of their proposed development so that houses are not taken so close to the boundary of the mill at the northern end and provide a scheme that is more acceptable in acoustic terms. 1. The BS 4142 assessment shows a 20dB rating level above background and the standard rightly concludes that such levels would cause serious adverse impact to residents. The background level on an evening shows a 20dB difference at 10pm between when the factory is operating and not. The existing background level after 10pm is very low at 25.9dBLA90. I do not accept the argument that the mill (BATA) should be taken as the background level. 2. The normal hours stated are 06:00 hrs (1 hour of which is classed as night-time) to 21.50 Monday to Sunday. The report acknowledges in other periods of the year the factory operates 24/7 and thus uses the argument that the measured background therefore should not be considered in absolute terms. It could equally be argued that this is the operating arrangements at this time but this could change in the future as I am not aware there are any hours restriction on the mill. 3. As an assessment using BS 4142 is unfavourable, an argument is made in relation to the use of absolute standards utilising BS8233:2014 and World Health Organisation (WHO) standards. The WHO standards however have been used selectively as they relate to a steady continuous noise, which is not the case here as the report advises that " The operations of the vehicles seem to have quite important incidence on the total noise in particular due to the "beeping " of the reversing alarms" . In addition what the standard says in relation to levels is " To protect the majority of people from being seriously annoyed during the daytime, the sound pressure level on balconies, terraces and outdoor living areas should not exceed 55dBLAeq for a steady, continuous noise. To protect the majority of people from being moderately annoyed during the daytime, the outdoor sound pressure level should not exceed 50dB LAeq. These values are based on annoyance studies, but most countries in Europe have adopted 40dB LAeq as the maximum allowable level for new developments (Gottlob 1995). Indeed, the lower value should be considered the maximum allowable sound pressure level for all new developments whenever feasible" . 4. In relation to internal levels the WHO standards state "In dwellings, the critical effects of noise are on sleep, annoyance and speech interference. To avoid sleep disturbance, indoor guideline values for bedrooms are 30 dB LAeq for continuous noise and 45dB LAmx for single sound events. Lower levels maybe annoying , depending on the nature of the noise source". Again the noise experience is unlikely to be steady continuous noise, a single noisy event at night time maybe	(-) The site is proximal to Malton Foods factory. Residential development already in close proximity. It is likely that noise mitigation measures could be implemented. The scheme also suggests live/work units which would be occupied by individuals who would expect some minor nuisance, and design measures could help ameliorate impacts.	(-) The site is adjacent to both residential development, and the school. Schools can cause noise issues for some residents, although it is considered with siting, and boundary treatment considerations could address any issues. The submitted schemes provide an access to the school could raise issues in terms of noise, but this would be a specific times of the day (and not at night). A Noise Assessment would be expected to consider the noise implications of the B1257. This would then allow further considerations around setting and positioning of properties to ensure no adverse acoustic impacts on residents.	(-) The site is proximal to BATA site, in particular, there is an entrance to the site used by lorries adjacent. Residential development already in close proximity. It is likely that noise mitigation measures would be necessary, and whether these are achievable within the context of the village design and character.
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(+) This is an employment site, adjacent to an established employment site. Uses are likely to complementary.	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding properties except to the north of the site where there is industrial operations.	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. There are some	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. There are some

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	<p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>			residential properties in proximity.	properties are residential in nature. The School is a factor to consider, but any impacts could be mitigated.	residential properties in proximity.
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(+)	(-) adverse noise impacts which are incapable of mitigation, and would lead to an unacceptable impact on new residents, and could fetter the operations of the site, which is identified as an important employment site to be retained in the Local Plan Strategy.	(-)	(+) subject to the consideration of the position of the school road, car park and existing/proposed properties.	(-)

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
Flood Risk						
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	Yes further investigation required --	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented.	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented, subject to the considerations around water contamination.	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented.	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented. FRA required. subject to the considerations around water contamination. The Local Lead Flood Authority have confirmed: There is no historic record of reports of flooding being made to the County Council, associated with the site. EA surface water plans demonstrate a risk of flooding 1 in 1000 year event on the north of the site near the school. Detailed drainage plans should be submitted as part of the application demonstrating how this risk would be mitigated by any future development. Vale of Pickering IDB	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented. FRA Required.
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++ Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development + Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site - Site not suitable for accommodating SDS -	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used. However, the presence of the source protection zone will require consideration.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used. However, the presence of the source protection zone will require consideration.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? *variable	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++ Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change + No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change - No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
	Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +					
	Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-					
	Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --					
People						
Q. 36 Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?	Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.
	Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location +					
	Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/use and no justification or alternative provided --					

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	<p>Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police +</p> <p>No – SBD principles not taken into account -</p>	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	<p>Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++</p> <p>Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +</p> <p>No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --</p>	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	(+) Information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths (no specific cycle routes) the PRow is retained in both schemes, although their layout is changed. The site also retained two existing footpaths which would link the northern parts of the site to the village.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	<p>Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++</p> <p>Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +</p> <p>Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --</p>	Travel Plan not required	Travel Plan not required	Travel Plan not required	No Travel Plan has been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that one could not be produced.	No Travel Plan has been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that one could not be produced.
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	<p>Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++</p> <p>Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +</p> <p>Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -</p>	Although there is no expectation of employment sites being allocated, there is an expectation that employment schemes will come forward outside of the allocations process.	No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided.	No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided.	Some details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. There is a mixture of 5-3 bed units. On site affordable homes would need to be provided, and this is referred to in the statement, but the precise format of those properties would need to be established.	No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided.
K Overall Rating for 'People'	<p>Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++</p> <p>Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +</p> <p>Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -</p> <p>Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --</p>	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	Some information has been submitted, but further clarification is needed regarding the provision of affordable housing	No information submitted.

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
Meeting needs						
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --</p>	<p>The ELR (2006) and update (2010) confirmed that Employment Land requirements were, for the most part, to be concentrated in the Market Towns, and that policies should be used to support the diversification of Ryedale's economic base, and the support in principle the expansion of existing established businesses. The BATA site is defined as an 'Other Employment Site' in the LPS. This site would contribute to meeting needs in the ELR in principle.</p>	<p>No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.</p>	<p>No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.</p>	<p>No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.</p>	<p>No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.</p>
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	<p>Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++</p> <p>Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +</p> <p>Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA -</p> <p>The development makes no provision for affordable housing --</p>	<p>The site is proposed for employment purposes.</p>	<p>(+)No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided, and with a theoretical yield of 19 units this would deliver some affordable housing (5-6) units on site. Indicative proposals show a higher yield but there are concerns with such an approach</p>	<p>(-)The submitter of the site has proposed three different schemes. One of the schemes makes some provision for affordable housing, the proportion is not identified. There would be a limited contribution of affordable housing through a contribution only.</p>	<p>(+)The agent for the site submitted a scheme whereby residential development would be a key element, and affordable housing is proposed, but there is no detail. Compliance with SP3 would be expected, subject to viability, and even with land set aside for the school a meaningful delivery of on-site affordable housing could be achieved.</p>	<p>(-)No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided in accordance with SP3.</p>
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	<p>Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++</p> <p>Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +</p> <p>Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population -</p> <p>The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --</p>	<p>The site is proposed for employment purposes.</p>	<p>No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.</p>	<p>The submitter of the site has proposed three different schemes. One of the proposals is a care home (C2) for the elderly (40-50 bed spaces). Although the County Council have stated that housing needs for the elderly (in the form of organised care) should be met within the Market Towns, not within the Service Villages. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.</p>	<p>No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site, as 44/45 units is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.</p>	<p>No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.</p>

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +					
	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -					
	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --					
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure						
Q45. On sites greater than 1ha	yes ++ No- transport assessment required--	Not required in the SM. But highways authority deem a TA required.	Not required	Not required	(--) A Transport assessment is required, but has not been submitted.	(--) A Transport assessment is required, but has not been submitted.
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++	Highways Authority determine that a TA is required to assess the impact.	(+) County Highways have considered: Acceptable access onto Amotherby Lane, impact on highway network will need to be determined by Traffic Assessment. Consider with site 3. Could be possible conflicts with existing factory traffic. Access feasibility study submitted by the adjacent landowner (site 3) for consideration of a wider access. (Not confirmed by submitter of this site)	(+) County Highways have considered: Acceptable onto Malton Road. Minor works may be required to extend existing footway/street lighting to serve the site. Need to consider cumulative impact.	The proposal would need to involve the creation of a new access from the south of the site onto the B1257. The agent has intimated that the Highways Authority consider "the junction can meet their design criteria".	(+) County Highways have considered: Acceptable onto Amotherby Lane. Both a Travel Plan and Traffic Impact Assessment required to assess impact. Possible conflict with factory traffic on other side. Consider cumulative impacts.
	Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +					
	Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation -					
	Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --					
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.
	Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated -					
	Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --					
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++	(+) No PROW are proximal, and no information has been submitted to create a new PROW (which is understandable given the nature of the proposed use).	(+) Two PROWs are proximal, and although they do not adjoin the site, there is some potential to link indirectly into these. No information has been submitted concerning this matter.	(+) The site is not proximal to a PROW, and no information has been submitted concerning the creation of such a right of way.	(++)There is a PROW currently on the site, which runs diagonally across the site. Details have been submitted as to how this would be treated. Given the position of the PROW it is inevitable that some form of diversion would be required, in the first instance.	(+) The site is not proximal to any of the established PROWs in Amotherby. No information has been provided concerning PROWs.
	Proposal will not affect a PROW +					
	Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --					

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	<p>Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++</p> <p>Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development+</p> <p>Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it --</p>	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm. The site is of a size where some form of public realm would be more achievable.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.
Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	<p>Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++</p> <p>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +</p> <p>Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy.</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy.</p>	<p>(++) Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. The proposed development scheme as submitted would leave land available for expansion of the primary school. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy.</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy.</p>

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
	<p>Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --</p>	<p>Surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>		<p>disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>	<p>flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p> <p>NYCC Children and Young People's Service (CYPS) and Amotherby Community Primary School have been made aware of a proposal by Signet Planning for a housing site adjacent to the School. CYPS would not generally comment on potential housing sites as regards the suitability of their location, density etc.</p> <p>However, should a housing allocation be proposed for the village, it appears this particular site could deliver a car park/drop off facility which would be of benefit to both School and wider community.</p>	<p>disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++		(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +					
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken -					
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --					
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++		(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility.	(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility.	(++) The site is immediately to the south of the primary school, and the proposed scheme incorporates an area of land providing parking which meets the identified needs of the school.	(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility.
	Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +					
	Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -					
	Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --					
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++		(+)	(+)	(++)	(+)
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +					
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -					
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --					
Strong Economy						
Q53. Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +					
	Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --					

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		3	8	61	148	181
Q.54 (Employment uses) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR?	Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++ Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +	(+) The site would allow the BATA to expand in due course.	NA	(+) One of the three potential schemes submitted refers to the development of B1 starter units (with residential) and this would support the delivery of a diversified economy.	NA	NA
Q. 55 (Retail and Employment uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++ Up to 50 net jobs created + Up to 50 net jobs lost - Up to 250 net jobs lost --	Unspecified.	NA	Unspecified.	NA	NA
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++ Proposal will have a positive impact on the economy + Proposal will have a negative impact on the economy - Proposal will have a significant negative impact on the economy --	(+)	Not applicable	(+)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability						
Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable) ++ Employment: Category I ++ Housing: Category 2 (Developable) + Employment: Category II + Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) -- Employment: Category III -		(+) Category 2 site in 2009 SHLAA	(+) Category 2 site in 2009 SHLAA	(+) Category 2 site in 2009 SHLAA	Not considered through the 2009 SHLAA.
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++ Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible + Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --	Subject to archaeological investigation	(--) noise impacts from BATA	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation. The site was subject to a number of landowners but the site submission identifies a single landowner now.	(--)-HSE advice Advise Against development
Developer Contributions						
Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++ Some contributions can be achieved + Limited contributions can be achieved - No contributions can be achieved --	Unknown	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified. Site is proposing to release land for school parking	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.
Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule?	Yes ++ No --	Unknown	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++ Site has some constraints and / or may not be able to support the full range of developer contributions + Site faces significant constraints and may not be able to support any developer contributions --	No response provided.	(--) suggested viability, but adverse impacts from noise are not capable of mitigation without reassessing the extent of the site through a further noise assessment.	(+)	(+)	(--)

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161	
Stage 1 - Sift									
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++)6.1ha	(--) 0.05ha	(++) 0.77ha	(--) 0.05ha	(++) 0.56ha	(++) 0.43ha	(++) 1.27ha	
	Less than 0.15 Ha --								
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy (SP1)	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(++)	(++)	(--) employment use	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --								
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further	Will Not cause harm ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Will cause harm --								
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --								
Stage 2 - Site Assessment									
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)		(+)		(++)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -							
		15 minutes walking time and over --							
	Local Shop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(--) In Swinton		(--) In Swinton		(--) In Swinton	(--) In Swinton	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -							
		15 minutes walking time and over --							
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(--)		(++)		(--)	(--)	(--)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -							
		15 minutes walking time and over --							
	Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)		(++)		(++)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -							
		15 minutes walking time and over --							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161			
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++	(-)		(+)		(-)	(-)	(++)			
	Site has good accessibility +										
	Site has variable accessibility –										
	Site has poor accessibility --										
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)			
	Flood Zone 2 +										
	Flood zone 3a –										
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)			
	Flood Zone 2										
	Flood Zone 3a										
	Less vulnerable ++										
	More vulnerable +										
Highly vulnerable -	Highly vulnerable --										
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++	(--)	SFRA complete but FRA will be required as >1ha	(--)	SFRA complete but FRA may be required in respect of surface water	(--)	SFRA complete but FRA may be required in respect of surface water	(--)	SFRA complete but FRA may be required in respect of surface water	(--)	SFRA complete but FRA will be required as >1ha
	No --										
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)			
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +										
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated –										
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --										
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and Highways England (HE) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	No observations from the Highways Authorities. Response provided for 61 by the County Highways Authority, but size of site is different. There is a existing access which is used by lorries.	(+) County Highways have considered: Access acceptable on Malton Road. Minor works may be required to extend footway/street lighting	(+) County Highways Authority considered: Access from Amotherby Lane acceptable- but impact on highway network determined by Traffic Assessment	(+) County Highways have considered: Access acceptable on Malton Road. Minor works may be required to extend footway/street lighting	No observations from the Highways Authorities currently provided. Access would need to be created onto B1257. Existing access is present.	No observations from the Highways Authorities currently provided. Access would need to be created onto B1257.	(-) County Highways have considered : The site has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense. Further information has been submitted by the site submitter to demonstrate			
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +										
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -										

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --							submitter to demonstrate access feasibility. The information has been submitted to the Highways Authority for consideration.
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity								
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	<p>Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++</p> <p>Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</p> <p>Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --</p>	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	<p>Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++</p> <p>Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --</p>	No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.	No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.	No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.	No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.	(+)No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible. The site is on a green infrastructure network, and this will allow linking into the existing corridor.	(+)No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible. The site is on a green infrastructure network, and this will allow linking into the existing corridor.	No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	<p>Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++</p> <p>Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</p> <p>Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--</p>	(+) No information has been submitted. The site is set within a backdrop of rising linear arable fields to the south providing distant views from Bray gate. The Tree and Landscape Officer's comments: To soften these views, and in keeping with the local landscape character, a line of native deciduous trees (Sycamore, field maple, or oak) required along the southern boundary of the site to supplement the existing screening effect provided by the existing boundary hedge; Retain existing frontage planting where appropriate; Applying the recommendations in BS 5837:2012 when designing the layout of the site in respects of existing trees and shrubs to be retained and the large mature tree at the south eastern corner of the site; Provide opportunities within the layout design to plant a small number of large native trees within the development on the largest plots (approximately 2% of plots throughout the site); Ensure a high standard of landscaping throughout the site.	(+) No information has been submitted concerning the impact on trees and hedgerows. The Council's Tree Officer has observed: There are two mature trees, a sycamore and an ash on the western boundary of the adjacent property's garden. These trees are particularly prominent on the approach to the village from the west. Retain all boundary hedges and trees applying the recommendations in BS 5837:2005. Introduce a new native hedgerow and trees along the northern boundary of the site; Promote TPO's on selected trees along the site boundaries, especially those along the eastern boundary; Ensure a high standard of landscaping internally within the development.	(+) No information has been submitted concerning the impact on trees and hedgerows. Tree and Landscape Officers recommendations: There will be a requirement to screen/augment boundaries with open countryside described above utilising locally native species. The development of the southern section of the site should also be carried out in accordance with the recommendations in BS 5837:2005 – Trees in relation to construction – recommendations to ensure that the ash tree on the site frontage is successfully integrated. Retain vegetation on all existing buildings.	(+) No information has been submitted concerning the impact on trees and hedgerows. The Council's Tree Officer has observed: There are two mature trees, a sycamore and an ash on the western boundary of the adjacent property's garden. These trees are particularly prominent on the approach to the village from the west. Retain all boundary hedges and trees applying the recommendations in BS 5837:2005. Introduce a new native hedgerow and trees along the northern boundary of the site; Promote TPO's on selected trees along the site boundaries, especially those along the eastern boundary; Ensure a high standard of landscaping internally within the development.	(+) On the opposite side of the road to the site there is a collection of 4 trees which are subject to a TPO. It is considered that by virtue of their distance from the site, there would not be an adverse impact on the trees. There are a row of trees which are integral to the streetscene, and whilst two trees are identified as being moderate risk, and the other trees of moderate quality, and the survey recommends some remedial works to the trees, to improve their condition and appearance, and ascertain through some ivy removal, the condition of the trees.	(-) No information has been submitted concerning the impact on trees and hedgerows. Access to the site could mean the loss of established hedgerow.	(+) No information has been submitted concerning the impact on trees and hedgerows. The Tree and Landscape Officer recommendations are: Retain existing boundary plantings and supplement the northern and western boundaries by the planting up of gaps with native species; Provide high quality landscaping for the development including small to medium sized trees and a small number of larger species where space permits in larger gardens, least one large native tree species (minimum 5% of plots) that can be viewed in the wider landscape without detriment to the enjoyment of individual properties or neighbouring properties. Retain the alignment of the existing public right of way across the site, include it within open space allocation, and enhance with an avenue of large mature native trees.

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161	
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity'	Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(-)	(+)	
	Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +								
	Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation -								
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --								
C Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting									
Q8 What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments which cover the Ryedale Area and Special Qualities Study (including views and open spaces)?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++	(-) The village of Amotherby is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. Being to the south of the B1257, the land rises in this site, and the site extends far up the slope, extending well beyond the built area and into the Howardian Hills AONB. As such the land has a relatively high sensitivity to development, and it is a common feature amongst the collection of villages along the B1257 is that their settlement evolution has acknowledged that by concentrating on the lower, flatter land to the north of the road, with limited development to the north. The existing hedgerows are important, they provide an important visual screen, and element of character. It is hard to view the back of the site viewed from further away to the east.	(-)The village of Amotherby is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. Site is a single plot, which is on the southern (Howardian Hills) side of B1257, it would exacerbate the incremental coalescence of Amotherby and Swinton, which is against policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy. The site visit has confirmed that is has become part of the residential curtilage of the existing property.	(+)The village of Amotherby is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. This site is within the flatter vale land, adjacent to the sports field. The scope and nature of existing development mean the site is screened from the south, despite the rising land. As such it is considered that this site could be accommodated within the landscape, subject to boundary treatment considerations.	(-)The village of Amotherby is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. Site is a single plot, which is on the southern (Howardian Hills) side of B1257, it would exacerbate the incremental coalescence of Amotherby and Swinton, which is against policy SP12 of the Local Plan Strategy. The site visit has confirmed that is has become part of the residential curtilage of the existing property.	(+)The village of Amotherby is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. Given that this site is sloping down from the road, and is enclosed by residential development on two sites, with a shelter belt of trees to the north, which are retained on indicative submissions, the site would visually less intrusive.	(-)The village of Amotherby is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. This site is a modest field, which is on the southern (Howardian Hills) side of B1257. The site is visually prominent, and its development would lead to the coalescence of Amotherby and Swinton.	(-) The village of Swinton is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. The site is enclosed by development on three aspects, with the western aspect being open. The land is sloping towards the north. It is a substantial site which although not in an absolute manner, would engender a sense that the land between Amotherby and Swinton is being eroded further. As such, part of the site may be more appropriate.	
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +								
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved -								
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --								

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment	371	381	489	612	635	636	161	
<p>Q8. What impact would the site have on the nationally designated landscapes of the North York Moors National Park and Howardian Hills AONB?</p>	<p>Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++</p> <p>Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +</p> <p>Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –</p> <p>Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --</p>	<p>(--) This site would have an adverse impact on the setting of the Howardian Hills AONB. The land here is open and rises to the south. The site extends far up the slope, well beyond the built area within the AONB. As a result this site has relatively high sensitivity. It was hard to view the back of the site viewed from further away to the east due to the presence of the mature hedging. The site is unlikely to impact on the National Park, by virtue of the distance, but the site would project up the hill.</p>	<p>(--) Site would be abutting the AONB. It is a small site, but by contributing to coalescence of Amotherby and Swinton it would be adversely affecting the setting of the AONB.</p>	<p>(+) As this one of the northernmost sites proposed, it is considered in combination with the lower, flatter, topography that it would not detract from the Howardian Hills AONB. Site is not close to the National Park, and is on flat land, considered that there would not be an intrusion on the setting of the National Park</p>	<p>(--) Site would be abutting the AONB. It is a small site, but by contributing to coalescence of Amotherby and Swinton it would be adversely affecting the setting of the AONB.</p>	<p>(+) This site is close to the AONB, but due to topography and being within the built up area, it is not considered that development of this site in principle would harm the character of the AONB and although land is rising, it is screened by trees.</p>	<p>(--) This site is in the Howardian Hills AONB, it would be visually prominent, given that the site is currently open, with some hedging, and development of this site would in itself lead to the coalescence of Amotherby and Swinton.</p>	<p>(+) The site is separated from the AONB by the road and development on either side of the road. The land is falling away and is surrounded by development on three sides. The site is screened as a result. Not proximal to the North York Moors and the topography of the land is flat and low-lying, as a result the development would not harm any designated landscapes.</p>
<p>Q10 Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features to minimise its impact or provide adequate landscape mitigation measures?</p>	<p>Site is capable of retaining and enhancing existing landscape features ++</p> <p>Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +</p> <p>Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed –</p>	<p>(--) No information has been submitted concerning the landscaping of the site, but the topography would it challenging to incorporate development.</p>	<p>(--) No information has been submitted concerning landscaping but the prevailing landscape character is for open, relatively low level hedging, and the presence of increasing the level of landscaping to 'screen' the site would still be harmful to the overall landscape character.</p>	<p>(+) No information has been submitted concerning landscape mitigation measures. Although it is expected hedgerows will be retained.</p>	<p>(--) No information has been submitted concerning landscaping but the prevailing landscape character is for open, relatively low level hedging, and the presence of increasing the level of landscaping to 'screen' the site would still be harmful to the overall landscape character.</p>	<p>(+) site can make advantageous use of the topography and tree screening. An indicative scheme makes use of the frontage of the site, leaving the rear as grass. It is not clear what is to become of this land, but it was not included as part of the site submission. The scheme retains most of the frontage trees.</p>	<p>(--) No information has been submitted concerning landscaping. The prevailing landscape character is for open, relatively low level hedging, and the presence of increasing the level of landscaping to 'screen' the site would still be harmful to the overall landscape character. The site is open in character, and this is inherently important to the site's contribution to settlement character by providing a visual break between Amotherby and Swinton. Any development would erode this open character.</p>	<p>(+) No information has been submitted concerning the landscaping. The site is separated from the AONB by the road and development on either side of the road. The land is falling away and is surrounded by development on three sides. The site is screened as a result, as such the landscape itself provides some means of minimising its impact. Property heights and landscaping measures will require further consideration.</p>

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	Development within the built form of the settlement ++	(+) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. This site is to the south of the village, forming part of an established industrial area, visibility from an westwards direction is limited, and it does not bring development closer to Swinton.	(--) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. Site is a single plot, which is on the southern side of the B1257, at the edge of the village. Development would incrementally cause encroachment between Amotherby and Swinton, contrary to Local Plan Strategy SP12, and the views of the local community.	(+) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. This site is unlikely to enhance the coalescence. It is to the northern area of the village, and is aligned with the existing development form of the village, so it would not cause any physical coalescence.	(--) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. The site is a single plot, which is on the southern side of the B1257, on the edge of the village. Despite its size, development would incrementally cause encroachment between Amotherby and Swinton, contrary to Local Plan Strategy SP12, and the views of the local community.	(+) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. This site is adjacent to the B1257, and concerns have been raised about settlement coalescence. The site is contained by existing development, and it would therefore not contribute to any actual or notional coalescence of the two settlements.	(--) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. This is the last open field between Amotherby and Swinton. Its development would lead to total coalescence of these two villages. Its open character could not be retained if development were to occur.	(-) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. Despite being on the western side (facing Amotherby) it is considered that development in principle at this site would not exacerbate a sense of coalescence, as the site is already screened by existing development (of single depth) which extends along the B1257. Although if the site was to be developed in full, this would contribute to an overall sense of 'merging'. Mitigation would be necessary to counteract this.
	Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement +							
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible –							
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible --							
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++	(--)	(--)	(+)	(--)	(+)	(--)	(-)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +							
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –							
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --							
Culture and Heritage								
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(+) The site is within the Listed Building buffer zone of the collection of Amotherby's Listed Buildings: the Church, St. Helens House and the Old Vicarage. But it is considered by virtue of distance, boundary treatments, the setting of these designated assets would be preserved.	(+) The site is within the Listed Building buffer zone of the collection of Amotherby's Listed Buildings: the Church, St. Helens House and the Old Vicarage. But it is considered by virtue of distance, boundary treatments, the setting of these designated assets would be preserved.	(+) The site is within the Listed Building buffer zone of the collection of Amotherby's Listed Buildings: the Church, St. Helens House and the Old Vicarage. But it is considered by virtue of distance, boundary treatments, the setting of these designated assets would be preserved.	(+) The site is within the Listed Building buffer zone of the collection of Amotherby's Listed Buildings: the Church, St. Helens House and the Old Vicarage. But it is considered by virtue of distance, boundary treatments, the setting of these designated assets would be preserved.	(+) The site is within both the Listed Building Buffer, which concerns the Church, St. Helens House and the Old Vicarage, which is offset to the north west, and screened by trees. It is also within the Scheduled Monument Buffer, but it is a considerable from the site, at over 1km.	(--) Site is opposite a Listed Lime Kiln Farmhouse, which is out with both Swinton and Amotherby. The setting of this farmhouse would be a consideration in the development of this site, as it would bring coalescence of the settlements, and reduce the sense of separation that the property currently experiences.	(+)Swinton has one Listed Building, a farm house, which is distanced from the village-proper. It is not considered that development of this site would harm the setting of the asset, although it is the site closest to the Listed Building, it is considered that mitigation would ensure that there is no harm to setting.
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +							
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –							

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
Q13 Will the site affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>	(--) It is considered that the nature and scale of this site, within the AONB, and the topography of land mean this site has the potential to adversely affect the wider setting of the village of Amotherby. NYCC Heritage unit advise: Site lies within an area of potential archaeological interest within Amotherby village. There is potential for Roman roadside settlement and activity to extend beneath the site of the present village, where remains of later, medieval settlement may also survive. Whilst the former use site may have disturbed any archaeological features, due to size of the site, & existing buildings present, advise securing a programme of archaeological mitigation, and geophysical survey over greenfield area of site, to be followed by trial trenching.	(--) the site would lead to incremental coalescence with Swinton, which would be detrimental to both settlement's character and historic form.	(+) Site's location and size mean that it is unlikely to harm the wider settlement character of Amotherby.	(--) the site would lead to incremental coalescence with Swinton, which would be detrimental to both settlement's character and historic form.	(-) Site's location and size mean that it is unlikely to harm the wider settlement character of Amotherby. From a settlement character perspective, later submissions have identified a 'gated entrance' which is not in keeping with a rural village. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: This site coincides with an area where there are records that a Romano-British occupation site was discovered in the 18th century in fields east of Manor Farm. Therefore, there is potential for Roman roadside settlement and activity. Geophysical survey and trial trenching are, therefore, advised. A Geophysical Survey has been undertaken, and this was followed by a programme of trial trenching. It concluded that the anomalies picked up by the geophysical survey were non-anthropogenic, and there are no archaeological finds.	(--) Development of this site will cause the full coalescence of Amotherby and Swinton, and this would be adverse to their individual characters and their historic settlement formation. There is potential for Roman roadside settlement and activity to extend beneath the site of the present village, where remains of later, medieval settlement may also survive. Geophysical survey and trial trenching are, therefore, advised. A Geophysical Survey has been undertaken, but not submitted for consideration; site submitter expects that an archaeological watching brief and investigation would be expected, to clarify the nature and significance of any asset.	(+) Site's location and size mean that it is unlikely to harm the wider settlement character of Swinton. NYCC Heritage advise: this site has the projected course of Roman road between Malton and Hovingham running through it and crop mark evidence from aerial photography indicates the presence of a ditched enclosure which suggests the presence of roadside settlement/activity. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>	(--) Subject to archaeological investigation	(--)	(+)	(--)	(+) archaeological evaluation undertaken- absence of archaeological finds. Gated feature of concern.	(--) Subject to archaeological investigation	(+) Subject to archaeological investigation
Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy								
Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?	<p>Site capable and developer willing++</p> <p>Site capable but developer unwilling -</p> <p>Site not capable --</p>	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.
Q16 Can the site link in to existing heat or power sources available in the District?	Site capable of linking in with existing heat or power source and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.
E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy'	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -							
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --							
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction								
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	To use thermal fabric above current Building Regulation requirements. Provided with roof mounted solar panels for electricity. A 'whole house' energy strategy will be adopted utilising passive solar gains and natural ventilation where possible, considering limits on the orientation. Dual aspect units improve the quality of daylight and sunlight.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.
	Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit --							
	Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --							
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction -							
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes +	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.
	No -							
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -							
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --							
Efficient Use of Land								
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++	(+) half the site has been previously developed (factory). Rest would be greenfield land.	0.05ha of Greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	0.77ha of Greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	0.05ha of Greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	0.56ha of greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	0.43ha of greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	1.27ha of greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	<p>Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++</p> <p>Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +</p> <p>Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -</p> <p>Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --</p>	Not residential	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could deliver c. 1 dwelling.	Not residential.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could deliver c. 1 dwelling.	(-) Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 11 dwellings. The indicative site layout confirms 22 dph (at 0.7ha) of 17 units. Further information has been provided which identifies 10 semi-detached dwellings, which are 3-bed	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 8 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 37 dwellings.
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	<p>Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++</p> <p>Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +</p> <p>Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -</p> <p>Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --</p>	(-) Former Quarry, currently factory.	No evidence of land contamination.	No evidence of land contamination.	No evidence of land contamination.	No evidence of land contamination.	No evidence of land contamination.	No evidence of land contamination.
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	<p>Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++</p> <p>Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +</p> <p>Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -</p> <p>Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --</p>	(-)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
Natural Resources								
Q. 23 Would the development of this site involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)?	<p>No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++</p> <p>Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -</p> <p>More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --</p>	(-) Part of site (over a third) is undeveloped grade 2 land. The site is therefore Best and Most Versatile Land. The land is cropped.	(-) 0.05ha of Grade 2 Land. The site is therefore Best and Most Versatile Land. It is used as garden land.	(-) 0.77ha of Grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is cropped.	(-) 0.05ha of Grade 2 Land. The site is therefore Best and Most Versatile Land. The land is used as garden land.	(-) 0.56ha of Grade 2 land. The site is therefore Best and Most Versatile Land. The site is grazed.	(-)0.43ha of Grade 2 land. The site is therefore Best and Most Versatile Land. The land is grazed.	(-) 1.27ha grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is grazed.
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	<p>Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?</p> <p>Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone -?</p> <p>Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --</p>	(--) within a mineral safeguarding area but adjacent to settlement	(++)	(++)	(++)	(-) within a mineral safeguarding area but adjacent to settlement	(-) within a mineral safeguarding area but adjacent to settlement	(-) within a mineral safeguarding area but adjacent to settlement

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++	No response requested from the Environment Agency.	No response requested from the Environment Agency.	No response requested from the Environment Agency	No response requested from the Environment Agency	(-)The site is underlain by the Coralline Oolite Formation, a member of the Corallian Group. The solid geology at this location is not overlain by superficial drift deposits. There is a licensed groundwater abstraction approximately 0.2km to the southeast of the site and the water is for use in a food manufacturing environment which may be particularly sensitive to pollution. The potentially transmissive nature of the geology and the absence of any drift deposits at the site mean that groundwater is highly vulnerable to contamination at this location. Consideration should be given to preventing pollution entering the groundwater environment, as a result of any development at the site, particularly given the proximity of the nearby groundwater abstraction. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment will be required A Phase 1 Environmental Risk Assessment concluded: The site is currently considered to pose a very low risk to adjacent sites (the surrounding environment) and controlled waters with respect to potential ground/groundwater contamination. A low risk is currently considered present of ground gas. Consequently, a detailed programme of extensive Phase 2 Ground Investigation works will be required to fully characterise the ground/groundwater conditions and ground gas regime below the development site with the resulting information suitable for submission to the Local Authority.	No response requested from the Environment Agency	No response requested from the Environment Agency
	Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +							
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -							
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --							
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++	No evidence of land instability. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design.	No evidence of land instability.	No evidence of land instability.	No evidence of land instability.	No evidence of land instability. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation design. A Phase 1 desk top	No evidence of land instability.	No evidence of land instability. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation
	Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +							
	Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out -							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
	Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --					Preliminary Environmental Risk Assessment has identified that the development site is currently considered to represent a low geotechnical risk. The site is currently considered to pose a very low risk to the proposed end users (ground contamination).		design.
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++ HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"	(++)	(++)	Amotherby has BATA which is a major hazard site . HSE inner zone. Employment use	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161	
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	<p>Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++</p> <p>Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +</p> <p>Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --</p>	(--)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-) Hydrogeological Risk Assessment required- Phase 2 Environment Risk Assessment required at planning application stage	(-) Hydrogeological Risk Assessment required- Phase 2 Environment Risk Assessment required at planning application stage	(+)
Amenity									
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible –</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(-) The site includes the Malton Foods factory. It is likely that noise mitigation measures could be implemented. The scheme also suggests live/work units which would be occupied by individuals who would expect some minor nuisance, and design measures could help ameliorate impacts.	(-) The site is proximal to the Malton Foods factory, which would need to be a consideration.	(+) This is an employment site, adjacent to an established employment site. Uses are likely to be complementary, given that the established sports facility is already in full operation.	(-) The site is proximal to the Malton Foods factory, which would need to be a consideration.	(-) Whilst initial observations raised no significant issues, a noise survey undertaken for the site has indicated that noise levels for (living and sleeping) rooms facing onto the road, would require some form of mechanical ventilation, as on a night time, open windows would lead to an unacceptable level of noise from traffic on the main road (B1257). This is in connection with using insulation within the design. This raises questions over whether the use of acoustically rated ventilation will be appropriate in rural homes, denying the occupants the reasonable capability of an occupant the ability to open a window on certain elevations.	(+) It is considered that the site is not in an area where nuisances such as noise, smell, light or dust would be at an unacceptable level.	(-) subject to the usual residential amenity considerations and the access affording appropriate noise mitigation for existing residents	
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The retention of	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding	(+) Expansion land for BATA enterprises, unlikely to create an adverse impact as an employment use.	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding properties are	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding	

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	<p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	industrial units will require specific consideration.	properties are residential in nature.		properties are residential in nature.	residential in nature.	properties are residential in nature.	properties are residential in nature.
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-) concerns about the noise attenuation mitigation proposed.	(+)	(-)

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
Flood Risk								
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	Yes further investigation required --	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented. FRA required.	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented.	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented.	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented.	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented. subject to the considerations around water contamination	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented.	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented. FRA required.
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++ Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development + Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site - Site not suitable for accommodating SDS -	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although the designation of the source protection zone.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	(--Paving and driveways locally to the houses to be permeable. Surface water from the houses under gardens- subject to infiltration tests. Surface water from the roadway drained in a similar manner, to be required if required by Yorkshire Water and NYCC as LLFA. The presence of the source protection zone, and the sensitivity of water abstraction source will require consideration.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used. However, the presence of the source protection zone will require consideration.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? *variable	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++ Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change + No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change - No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
	Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +							
	Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-							
	Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --							
People								
Q. 36 Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?	Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact directly, but the site would surround the established sports pitch, and would limit opportunities for expansion.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.
	Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location +							
	Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/use and no justification or alternative provided --							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	<p>Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police +</p> <p>No – SBD principles not taken into account -</p>	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	<p>Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++</p> <p>Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +</p> <p>No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --</p>	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	<p>Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++</p> <p>Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +</p> <p>Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --</p>	No Travel Plan has been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that one could not be produced.	Travel Plan not required	Travel Plan not required	Travel Plan not required	Travel Plan not required	Travel Plan not required	No Travel Plan has been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that one could not be produced.
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	<p>Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++</p> <p>Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +</p> <p>Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -</p>	Although there is no expectation of employment sites being allocated, there is an expectation that employment schemes will come forward outside of the allocations process.	This is a site which proposes a single dwelling.	Although there is no expectation of employment sites being allocated, there is an expectation that employment schemes will come forward outside of the allocations process.	This is a site which proposes a single dwelling.	(--) The site proposed 10 semi-detached 3 bed dwellings, which at 10 dwellings would therefore provide only a commuted sum, and no affordable housing provision, despite the indicative yield being for 17 units.	No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided.	No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided.
K Overall Rating for 'People'	<p>Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++</p> <p>Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +</p> <p>Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -</p> <p>Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --</p>	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
Meeting needs								
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	<p>Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++</p> <p>Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +</p> <p>Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -</p> <p>No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --</p>	<p>The ELR (2006) and update (2010) confirmed that Employment Land requirements were, for the most part, to be concentrated in the Market Towns, and that policies should be used to support the diversification of Ryedale's economic base, and the support in principle the expansion of existing established businesses. The Malton Foods site is defined as an 'Other Employment Site' in the LPS. This site would contribute to meeting needs in the ELR in principle.</p>	<p>No details have been provided concerning the type and tenure of dwelling to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.</p>	<p>The ELR (2006) and update (2010) confirmed that Employment Land requirements were, for the most part, to be concentrated in the Market Towns, and that policies should be used to support the diversification of Ryedale's economic base, and the support in principle the expansion of existing established businesses. The BATA site is defined as an 'Other Employment Site' in the LPS. This site would contribute to meeting needs in the ELR in principle.</p>	<p>No details have been provided concerning the type and tenure of dwelling to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.</p>	<p>(--) Initially no details were provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings. This proposal would at 10 dwellings would not provide any on-site affordable housing, but would provide a commuted sum.</p>	<p>No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.</p>	<p>No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.</p>
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	<p>Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++</p> <p>Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +</p> <p>Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA -</p> <p>The development makes no provision for affordable housing --</p>	<p>The submissions have suggested provision of affordable homes, were the site to be developed for residential purposes.</p>	<p>A singular dwelling scheme.</p>	<p>The site is proposed for employment purposes.</p>	<p>A singular dwelling scheme.</p>	<p>(--) Initially, no details had been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. If the indicative yield was achieved, on site affordable homes would need to be provided in accordance with SP3, limited potential for such delivery. However, the scheme proposes 10 units which would mean no affordable housing provision on site, and only a commuted sum.</p>	<p>(-)No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided. No affordable housing could be provided on site, but a commuted sum would be expected.</p>	<p>(+)No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided in accordance with SP3.</p>
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	<p>Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++</p> <p>Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +</p> <p>Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population -</p> <p>The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --</p>	<p>The site has been proposed for mixed employment and residential purposes.</p>	<p>A singular dwelling scheme. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.</p>	<p>The site is proposed for employment purposes.</p>	<p>A singular dwelling scheme. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.</p>	<p>No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.</p>	<p>No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.</p>	<p>No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.</p>

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(--based on later submissions)	(-)	(-)
	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +							
	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -							
	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --							
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure								
Q45. On sites greater than 1ha	yes ++	(--A Transport assessment is required, but has not been submitted.	Not required	Not required	Not required	Not required	Not required	(-- A Transport assessment is required, but has not been submitted.
	No- transport assessment required--							
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++	No observations from the Highways Authorities. Response provided for 61 by the County Highways Authority, but size of site is different. There is a existing access which is used by lorries.				The site is proximal to the B1257 and the junction which links Amotherby with Kirkbymoorside (A170) and the villages of the central Vale of Pickering. It will be necessary to obtain the views of the Highway Authority. Submitted information indicates a single access onto the B1257.	No observations from the Highways Authorities currently provided. Access would need to be created onto B1257.	(-) County Highways have considered : The site has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense. Further information has been submitted by the site submitter to demonstrate access feasibility. The information has been submitted to the Highways Authority for consideration.
	Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +							
	Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation -							
	Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --							
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.
	Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated -							
	Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --							
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++	(+) The site is not proximal to any of the established PROWs in Amotherby. No information has been provided concerning PROWs.	(+) The site is not proximal to any of the established PROWs in Amotherby. No information has been provided concerning PROWs. This is a small site- and PROWs would not be delivered.	(+) No PROW are proximal, and no information has been submitted to create a new PROW (which is understandable given the nature of the proposed use).	(+) The site is not proximal to any of the established PROWs in Amotherby. No information has been provided concerning PROWs. This is a small site- and PROWs would not be delivered.	(+) The site is not proximal to any of the established PROWs in Amotherby. No information has been provided concerning PROWs.	(+) The site is not proximal to any of the established PROWs in Amotherby. No information has been provided concerning PROWs.	(+) There is a PROW which is present to the very north of the site (although not within the boundary of the site). No details have been submitted about connecting into this PROW, which links to Amotherby.
	Proposal will not affect a PROW +							
	Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment	371	381	489	612	635	636	161
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	<p>Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++</p> <p>Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development+</p> <p>Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it --</p>	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm. The site is of a size where some form of public realm would be more achievable were the site to be re-configured.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.
Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	<p>Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++</p> <p>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +</p> <p>Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation –</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Site submitter and Yorkshire Water have noted that a 150mm sewer runs through the site. The positioning of development will need to take this into account. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be</p>

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
	Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --	Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	Surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.	development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++	(++)				(++)	(++)	(++)
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +							
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken -							
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --							
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++	(-) by virtue of the size of the site, is likely that the site may have an impact on community facilities.				(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility.	(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility.	(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility.
	Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +							
	Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -							
	Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --							
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++	(-)				(+)	(+)	(-) due to highway constraints which have not been conclusively resolved.
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +							
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -							
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --							
Strong Economy								
Q53. Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +							
	Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		371	381	489	612	635	636	161	
Q.54 (Employment uses) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR?	Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++	(+) The scheme has suggested a mixed use, but the nature of that has not been set out.	NA	(+) The site would allow the BATA to expand in due course. It is in part identified in the former plan as expansion land for BATA.	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +								
Q. 55 (Retail and Employment uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++	Unspecified.	NA	Unspecified	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Up to 50 net jobs created +								
	Up to 50 net jobs lost -								
	Up to 250 net jobs lost --								
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++	(+) Malton Foods have confirmed their support for the continued identification of the land for their business expansion, as opposed to mixed development.	Not applicable	(+) BATA have confirmed their support for the continued identification of the land for their business expansion.	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	
	Proposal will have a positive impact on the economy +								
	Proposal will have a negative impact on the economy -								
	Proposal will have a significant negative impact on the economy --								
Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability									
Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable)++	Employment: Category I ++	(+) Category 2 site in 2009 SHLAA				Not considered through the 2009 SHLAA.	Not considered through the 2009 SHLAA.	(-) Category 1 site in 2009 in SHLAA but access is not conclusively established.
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +	Employment: Category II +							
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --	Employment: Category III -							
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation and further ground condition surveys	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible +								
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --								
Developer Contributions									
Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	(-) Initial response was consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified. The subsequent information has identified that limited affordable housing (i.e. Contributions) would be capable of being sought.	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	Same as per 254	
	Some contributions can be achieved +								
	Limited contributions can be achieved -								
	No contributions can be achieved --								
Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule?	Yes ++	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	Same as per 254	
	No --								
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	No response provided	No response provided	No response provided	No response provided	(+)	(+)	(+) Subject to access	
	Site has some constraints and / or may not be able to support the full range of developer contributions +								
	Site faces significant constraints and may not be able to support any developer contributions --								

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478	
Stage 1 - Sift									
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++) 1.9ha	(++) 1.28ha	(++) 1.16ha	(++)0.78ha	(++) 0.64ha	(++)1.18ha	(++)1.35ha	
	Less than 0.15 Ha --								
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy (SP1)	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --								
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further	Will Not cause harm ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Will cause harm --								
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --								
Stage 2 - Site Assessment									
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(++)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -							
		15 minutes walking time and over --							
	Local Shop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(++)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -							
		15 minutes walking time and over --							
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(--) In Amotherby	(--) In Amotherby	(--) In Amotherby	(--) In Amotherby	(--) In Amotherby	(--) In Amotherby	(--) In Amotherby
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -							
		15 minutes walking time and over --							
	Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +							
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -							
		15 minutes walking time and over --							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++	(++)	(++)	(+)	(+)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Site has good accessibility +							
	Site has variable accessibility -							
	Site has poor accessibility --							
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2 +							
	Flood zone 3a -							
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Flood Zone 2							
	Flood Zone 3a							
	Less vulnerable ++							
	More vulnerable +							
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)
	No --	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(--)
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +							
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated -							
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --							
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and Highways England (HE) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(--)	(-)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(+)	(--)
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +							
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --	land to provide access/drainage to a lane to the north of the site (un-named) which would link into Low Lane, which is already identified as being sub-standard (see site346) . Further submissions were then received which identified a connection to East Street. However, that has already been identified as being sub-standard (see 478). The access road is indicated as being in the landowner's ownership.	submitter to demonstrate access feasibility. The information has been submitted to the Highways Authority for consideration.	widening and root paths. The scheme proposes to improve 'to adoptable standard' the part of Low Lane up to the junction with sports facility the site outline has been revised to accommodate this- but there is no legal confirmation that this is within their capacity to undertake. The submitted drawings have not been assessed by the Highways Authority but show Low Lane as a narrower road than the road serving the estate.	widening and root paths. Site does not include a sufficient frontage to enable access of acceptable standards to be formed onto the public highway. Low lane would need to be upgraded to enable further development off Low Lane.	can not be achieved onto Swinton Lane.	the proposed use, this may require additional facilities/service provision.	narrow in nature and may need to be widened/improved if the use of this road is to be intensified.
Biodiversity and Geo-diversity								
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNRs or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	<p>Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++</p> <p>Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</p> <p>Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --</p>	(-) There is a pond which is not a designated asset of biodiversity but its presence could mean protected species potentially inhabit the area. If there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species. The site submitter indicates retention of the pond	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment	178	254	341	346	455	456	478
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	<p>Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++</p> <p>Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –</p> <p>No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --</p>	<p>(+)No specific information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible. The presence of pond is a consideration, and would assist in increasing green infrastructure opportunities.</p>	<p>No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.</p>	<p>(+) Scheme proposes retention of existing established hedgerows and woodland.</p>	<p>(+)No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible. Site submitter would look at retention of trees and hedges</p>	<p>No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.</p>	<p>No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.</p>
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	<p>Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++</p> <p>Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</p> <p>Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</p> <p>Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--</p>	<p>(+)No information has been submitted. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer made the following observations and recommendations on the 5 sites to the east of Swinton: Retain vegetation and trees subject to BS 5837:2005 survey requirements, along western and northern boundaries and supplement the eastern boundaries by the planting up of gaps with native species and providing a linear native tree/scrub strip along the whole of this boundary against open countryside. Provide plots throughout the development capable of accommodating at least one large native tree species (minimum 5% of plots) that can be viewed in the wider landscape without detriment to the enjoyment of individual buildings and property or neighbouring properties. Provide native linear plantation (minimum 4m wide) along eastern boundary to soften edge with countryside and to screen views from the east. Retain pond in area of open space. Carry out appropriate pond survey in accordance with prevailing legislation.</p>	<p>(+) No information has been submitted concerning the impact on trees and hedgerows. The Tree and Landscape Officer recommendations are: Retain existing boundary plantings and supplement the northern and western boundaries by the planting up of gaps with native species; Provide high quality landscaping for the development including small to medium sized trees and a small number of larger species where space permits in larger gardens, least one large native tree species (minimum 5% of plots) that can be viewed in the wider landscape without detriment to the enjoyment of individual properties or neighbouring properties. Retain the alignment of the existing public right of way across the site, include it within open space allocation, and enhance with an avenue of large mature native trees.</p>	<p>(+)Retain vegetation, and trees subject to BS 5837:2005 survey requirements, along southern, western, and eastern boundaries, and large tree towards southern end of western boundary, also the planting up of gaps with native species. Retain trees along Low Lane where plot frontages practically allow. Provide high quality landscaping for the development including small to medium sized trees and a small number of larger species where space permits in larger gardens. Provide plots throughout the development capable of accommodating at least one large native tree species (minimum 5% of plots) that can be viewed in the wider landscape without detriment to the enjoyment of individual buildings and property or neighbouring properties. Provide native linear plantation (minimum 6m wide) along southern boundary to screen views from southern approach. Provide high quality landscaping for the development including small to medium sized trees and a small number of larger species where space permits on larger plots.</p>	<p>(+)No information has been submitted concerning the impact on trees and hedgerows. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer has made the following recommendations. Retain vegetation, and trees subject to BS 5837:2005 survey requirements, along western and northern boundaries. Retain existing boundary hedges and supplement the northern boundaries by the planting up of gaps with native species. Provide plots throughout the development capable of accommodating at least one large native tree species (minimum 5% of plots) that can be viewed in the wider landscape without detriment to the enjoyment of individual buildings and property or neighbouring properties. Provide native linear plantation (minimum 6m wide) along southern boundary to screen views from southern approach. Provide high quality landscaping for the development including small to medium sized trees and a small number of larger species where space permits on larger plots.</p>	<p>(+) No information has been submitted concerning the impact on trees and hedgerows. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer has made the following recommendations. Retain vegetation, and trees subject to BS 5837:2005 survey requirements, along western and northern boundaries. Retain existing boundary hedges and supplement the northern boundaries by the planting up of gaps with native species. Provide plots throughout the development capable of accommodating at least one large native tree species (minimum 5% of plots) that can be viewed in the wider landscape without detriment to the enjoyment of individual buildings and property or neighbouring properties. Provide native linear plantation (minimum 6m wide) along southern boundary to screen views from southern approach. Provide high quality landscaping for the development including small to medium sized trees and a small number of larger species where space permits on larger plots.</p>	<p>(+)No information has been submitted. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer made the following observations and recommendations on the 5 sites to the east of Swinton: Retain vegetation and trees subject to BS 5837:2005 survey requirements, along western and northern boundaries and supplement the eastern boundaries by the planting up of gaps with native species and providing a linear native tree/scrub strip along the whole of this boundary against open countryside. Provide plots throughout the development capable of accommodating at least one large native tree species (minimum 5% of plots) that can be viewed in the wider landscape without detriment to the enjoyment of individual buildings and property or neighbouring properties. Provide native linear plantation (minimum 4m wide) along eastern boundary to soften edge with countryside and to screen views from the east.</p>

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478	
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity'	Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++	(+) subject to detailed considerations re. the pond	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	
	Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +								
	Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation -								
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --								
C Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting									
Q8 What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments which cover the Ryedale Area and Special Qualities Study (including views and open spaces)?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++	(-) The village of Swinton is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. This site is one of a collection of sites submitted to the eastern extent of the village. Here the topography is sloping downwards, gently onto the Vale. Single depth development has occurred to west of the site. The principle of 'at depth' development has occurred at Parsons Yard. It is considered that part of the site may be appropriate for development.	(-) The village of Swinton is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. The site is enclosed by development on three aspects, with the western aspect being open. The land is sloping towards the north. It is a substantial site which although not in an absolute manner, would engender a sense that the land between Amotherby and Swinton is being eroded further. As such, part of the site may be more appropriate.	(+) The village of Swinton is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. This site is adjacent to the built up edge, on low lying land at the northern end of the village. The field is currently grazed and bounded by a mixture of hedging and fencing. It is considered that the site in full could be extending too far.	(--) The village of Swinton is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. This site is currently an open grazed field, adjacent to the sports centre. The field is low-lying and open. development here would be both visually prominent and separated from the settlement, there has not been a level of development occur which would allow the development of this field to be integrated into the built form of Swinton, the	(--) The village of Swinton is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. Limited development has occurred to the south of the B1257, in part because the land begins to rise at this point. This site is to the rear of existing development and would involve part of a larger field. It is considered that the topography; rising open fields will be visually prominent if developed.	(--) The village of Swinton is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. Limited development has occurred to the south of the B1257, in part because the land begins to rise at this point. This site is undeveloped, and no development is physically adjacent. The site is a part of a larger field. It is considered that the topography; rising open fields will be visually prominent if developed. It would have a greater impact than 455 because of the lack of adjacent development.	(-) The village of Swinton is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. This site is one of a collection of sites submitted to the eastern extent of the village. Here the topography is sloping downwards, gently onto the Vale. Single depth development has occurred to west of the site. The principle of 'at depth' development has occurred at Parsons Yard. There is also development along the B1257, which would, in part screen the site from the higher land to the south of the road. It is considered that part of the site may be appropriate for development.	
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +								
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved -								
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --								

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment	178	254	341	346	455	456	478	
<p>Q8. What impact would the site have on the nationally designated landscapes of the North York Moors National Park and Howardian Hills AONB?</p>	<p>Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++</p> <p>Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +</p> <p>Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –</p> <p>Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --</p>	<p>(-) This site is one of the northernmost collection of five sites submitted on the eastern side of the village. In combination these sites extend out almost to the end of the linear strip development along the B1257. Currently development on this side is predominantly single depth, save for the Pearson's Yard. This is a substantial extension out into the open countryside, and would include the existing pond. It is a matter of how far out the sites project which will be a determining factor in terms of the impact on settlement character, but due to the presence of existing development and the road it is unlikely to harm the setting of the AONB. The site is not proximal to the North York Moors and the topography of the land is flat and low-lying</p>	<p>(+) The site is separated from the AONB by the road and development on either side of the road. The land is falling away and is surrounded by development on three sides. The site is screened as a result. Not proximal to the North York Moors and the topography of the land is flat and low-lying, as a result the development would not harm any designated landscapes.</p>	<p>(+) As this one of the northernmost sites proposed, it is considered in combination with the lower, flatter, topography that it would not detract from the Howardian Hills AONB. It is not proximal to the North York Moors and the topography of the land is flat and low-lying.</p>	<p>(+) As this one of the northernmost sites proposed, it is considered in combination with the lower, flatter, topography that it would not detract from the Howardian Hills AONB, but it would harm the settlement character of Swinton as described above. Not proximal to the North York Moors and the topography of the land is flat and low-lying</p>	<p>(-) The site is within the AONB. The site would be prominent, with the topography of the land begins to rise, but it would not lead to skyline development, and there is development to the north of the site, which could mitigate the impacts. It is considered that without care, this site could harm the setting of the AONB. Not proximal to the North York Moors.</p>	<p>(--) The site is within the AONB, and is open rising land, there is no made-made or natural screening. As such this site has the potential to impact on the special qualities of the AONB. The topography of the land begins to rise, but it would not lead to skyline development, nor is the site proximal to the North York Moors.</p>	<p>(-) This site is the most southern site of a collection of five sites submitted on the eastern side of the village. In combination these sites extend out almost to the end of the linear strip development along the B1257. Currently development on this side is predominantly single depth, save for the Pearson's Yard. This is a substantial extension out into the open countryside. It is a matter of how far out the sites project which will be a determining factor. It would be screened by existing development from the south, but it would be visible from Broughton, and the land begins to rise. Not proximal to the North York Moors and the topography of the land is flat and low-lying.</p>
<p>Q10 Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features to minimise its impact or provide adequate landscape mitigation measures?</p>	<p>Site is capable of retaining and enhancing existing landscape features ++</p> <p>Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +</p> <p>Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed –</p>	<p>(-) No information has been submitted concerning the landscaping. The nature and scope of the development will affect the nature of landscaping required, and the presence of the pond needs to be considered. It is expected that existing boundary hedges should be retained wherever possible. Owing to the low field boundaries on the eastern side of the fields the site is highly visible when approaching from the east along the public right of way that connects Swinton and Broughton.</p>	<p>(+) No information has been submitted concerning the landscaping. The site is separated from the AONB by the road and development on either side of the road. The land is falling away and is surrounded by development on three sides. The site is screened as a result, as such the landscape itself provides some means of minimising its impact. Property heights and landscaping measures will require further consideration.</p>	<p>(+) No detailed information has been submitted concerning the landscaping. This site abuts the existing development in the village, the site is low, and flat, and has some existing hedging, which there would be an expectation that this hedging would be retained wherever possible. The site submission proposes to retain a copse.</p>	<p>(--) This site is physically separate from the village-proper, and would be proximal to an isolated collection of dwellings, but because of the nature of the topography which although being flat is relatively open. It is considered that this site is physically distanced from the village, and there is no landscape mitigation measures which can overcome this. Site submitter has suggested that 1-1/2 storey schemes with selective materials and retention of trees and hedges would be sufficient. There are some isolated buildings in proximity but they are also distanced from the village, and do not contribute to a sense of integration.</p>	<p>(-) No information has been submitted concerning landscaping. It is considered that development of this site will have limited capability to use existing landscape features because of the open fields, limited screening and rising topography, despite the existing development to the north.</p>	<p>(--) It is considered that development of this site will have particularly limited capability to use existing landscape features because of the open fields, limited screening and rising topography. It is also considered that is a site which is not capable of minimising its impact, through mitigation because of the open, elevated nature of the site.</p>	<p>(-) this is a substantial site, although the frontage development to the south would provide screening, the land falls gently away from the road, the Pearson's Yard development is proximal. Owing to the low field boundaries on the eastern side of the fields the site is highly visible when approaching from the east along the public right of way that connects Swinton and Broughton.</p>

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	Development within the built form of the settlement ++	(+) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. It is considered that the development of this site would not exacerbate a sense of coalescence in principle, by virtue of its eastern orientation.	(-) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. Despite being on the western side (facing Amotherby) it is considered that development in principle at this site would not exacerbate a sense of coalescence, as the site is already screened by existing development (of single depth) which extends along the B1257. Although if the site was to be developed in full, this would contribute to an overall sense of 'merging'. Mitigation would be necessary to counteract this.	(+)Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. Development of this site would not exacerbate any physical sense of coalescence, because the site is situated to the north of the built extent of the settlement, which is distanced from Amotherby, and the site would not extend beyond the existing built extent of Swinton. The site has been assessed against the Natural England (NE) Impact Risk Zones. No automatic requirement to consult NE. However, NE has been consulted.	(+) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. Development of this site would not exacerbate a sense of coalescence in principle; being to the north of Swinton.	(+) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. This site would not exacerbate a sense of coalescence in principle, as it is located to the east of the village.	(+) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. This site would not exacerbate a sense of coalescence in principle, as it is located to the east of the village.	(+) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. Development of this site would not exacerbate a sense of coalescence in principle, by virtue of its eastern orientation.
	Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement +							
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible –							
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible --							
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++	(-)	(-)	(+)	(--)	(--)	(--)	(-)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +							
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –							
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --							
Culture and Heritage								
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(+) Development in this site would not impact on the setting of any designated heritage asset. There is a Listed milepost, this would not be harmed by virtue of its lack of proximity to the site.	(+)Swinton has one Listed Building, a farm house, which is distanced from the village-proper. It is not considered that development of this site would harm the setting of the asset, although it is the site closest to the Listed Building, it is considered that mitigation would ensure that there is no harm to setting.	(+) Development in this site would not impact on the setting of any designated heritage asset. There is a Listed milepost, this would not be harmed by virtue of its lack of proximity to the site.	(+) Development in this site would not impact on the setting of any designated heritage asset. There is a Listed milepost, this would not be harmed by virtue of its lack of proximity to the site.	(-)It is considered that development in this site would need to consider the setting to the Listed milepost, which is close to the site.	(-)It is considered that development in this site would need to consider the setting to the Listed milepost, which is close to the site.	(+) Development in this site would not impact on the setting of any designated heritage asset. There is a Listed milepost, this would not be harmed by virtue of its lack of proximity to the site.
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +							
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –							

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment	178	254	341	346	455	456	478	
Q13 Will the site affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>	<p>(-) The scale of the site is significant, and would be a significant projection out from the village, part of the site would have a lessened impact. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Site lies north of Roman road running between Malton and Hovingham. Has potential for the presence of remains of roadside activity/settlement and other features nearby recorded from aerial photography suggest potential for earlier, prehistoric remains also. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(+) Site's location and size mean that it is unlikely to harm the wider settlement character of Swinton. NYCC Heritage advise: this site has the projected course of Roman road between Malton and Hovingham running through it and crop mark evidence from aerial photography indicates the presence of a ditched enclosure which suggests the presence of roadside settlement/activity. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(+) Site's location and size mean that it is unlikely to harm the wider settlement character of Swinton. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Site lies further south of Roman road than other sites in the village of Swinton, however, remains of the Roman period, including burials, have been found in a similar location close to the former railway line in nearby Broughton village, so this site is considered one of potential for Roman period remains. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(--) The development of this site would be separate from the existing settlement, it would not pay reference to the historic form and character of Swinton. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Site lies further south of Roman road than other sites in the village of Swinton, however, remains of the Roman period, including burials, have been found in a similar location close to the former railway line in nearby Broughton village, so this site is considered one of potential for Roman period remains. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(-) Development on this site would represent development rising up the slope, the land is open, sweeping and visually prominent. It is considered it could have an adverse impact on settlement character. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Site lies south of Roman road running between Malton and Hovingham. Has potential for the presence of remains of roadside activity/settlement and other features nearby recorded from aerial photography, including linear ditch and pit alignment heading towards the site, suggest potential for earlier, prehistoric remains also. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(-) Development on this site would represent a new direction of development for the settlement, the land is open, sweeping and visually prominent. It is considered it could have a significant adverse impact on settlement character. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Site lies south of Roman road running between Malton and Hovingham. Has potential for the presence of remains of roadside activity/settlement and other features nearby recorded from aerial photography, including linear ditch and pit alignment heading towards the site, suggest potential for earlier, prehistoric remains also. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(-) The scale of the site is significant, and would be a significant projection out from the village, part of the site would have a lessened impact. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: this site has the projected course of Roman road between Malton and Hovingham running through it and crop mark evidence from aerial photography indicates the presence of a number of features including a ditched enclosure, ring ditch & pit alignment which suggests the presence of roadside settlement/activity and potential earlier, prehistoric remains. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>	(-) Subject to archaeological investigation	(+) Subject to archaeological investigation	(+) Subject to archaeological investigation	(--) Subject to Archaeological investigation, which the site submitted is happy to undertake	(-) Subject to archaeological investigation	(--) Subject to archaeological investigation	(-) Subject to archaeological investigation
Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy								
Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?	<p>Site capable and developer willing++</p> <p>Site capable but developer unwilling -</p> <p>Site not capable --</p>	<p>Agent of site has said energy conservation and use of renewable resources will be "achieved by building design features". There is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.</p>	<p>No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.</p>	<p>No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.</p>	<p>The site submitter is proposing a Passivhaus scheme. As such there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.</p>	<p>No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.</p>	<p>No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.</p>	<p>No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.</p>

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	By proposing a Passivhaus the site would not link in, or support off-site renewable energy.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.
Q16 Can the site link in to existing heat or power sources available in the District?	Site capable of linking in with existing heat or power source and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.
E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy'	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++	(-) Using design-led efficiencies	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage	(++)	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -							
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --							
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction								
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++ Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit -- Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	(++) Passivhaus scheme where insulation, air tightness and mechanical ventilation, and passive solar gain, and shading. As such this would be likely to be two levels higher than the mandatory limit.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++ No proposals suggested for waste reduction -	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but much of the 'Passive Haus' construction is done off site, with manufactured elements-reducing waste.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes + No -	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.	(++)	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -							
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --							
Efficient Use of Land								
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++ Site is up to 50% Brownfield +	1.9ha of greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	1.28ha of greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	1.16ha of greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	0.78ha of greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	0.64ha of greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	1.18ha of greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	1.35ha of greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 40 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 26 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 24 dwellings. The indicative scheme proposes 20 units.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 16 dwellings. The site submitter considers that the site could contain 24 2-3bed houses and 2 bed bungalows.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 13 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 25 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 28 dwellings.
	Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +							
	Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -							
	Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --							
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++	No evidence of land contamination.	No evidence of land contamination.	No evidence of land contamination.	No evidence of land contamination.	No evidence of land contamination. Adjacent to a former quarry.	Historic (1854) map shows general quarrying.	No evidence of land contamination.
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +							
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -							
	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --							
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++	(+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+)	(+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+)	(+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+)	(+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+)	(+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+)	(+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+)	(+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+) (+)
	Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +							
	Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -							
	Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --							
Natural Resources								
Q. 23 Would the development of this site involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)?	No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++	(-) 1.9ha grades 2-3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as both grades 2 and 3, and therefore there is a high possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is grazed.	(-) 1.28ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is grazed.	(-) 1.54 ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is grazed.	(-) 0.78ha of grades 2 and 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grades 2 and 3, and therefore there is a high possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is grazed.	(-) 0.64ha of grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is cropped.	(-) 1.18ha of grades 2 and 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grades 2 and 3, and therefore there is a high possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is cropped.	(-) 1.35ha grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is grazed.
	Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -							
	More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --							
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?	(-- within a mineral safeguarding area but adjacent to settlement	(-- within a mineral safeguarding area but adjacent to settlement	(++)	(++)	(-- within a mineral safeguarding area but adjacent to settlement	(-- within a mineral safeguarding area but adjacent to settlement	(-- within a mineral safeguarding area but adjacent to settlement
	Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone -?							
	Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --							

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++	(-) Northern part of the site is the Amptill Clay & Kimmeridge Clay formations. The southern part of the site is underlain by the Coralline Oolite Formation ; a member of the Corallian Group principal aquifer. The whole site is overlain by drift deposits of sand & gravel; likely to have high permeability. A licensed groundwater abstraction approximately 1km to the southwest of the site and the water is for use in a food manufacturing environment which may be particularly sensitive to pollution. The geology across the northern portion of the site is not suitable for use as an aquifer due to its low permeability. However, the solid geology is overlain by permeable drift deposits and in developing the site it should be considered that any pollution entering the drift may migrate toward the principal aquifer to the south. The southern part of the site is much more vulnerable to pollution and this should be considered as part of any development at this location, particularly given the proximity of the nearby groundwater abstraction. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment will be required.	No response requested from the Environment Agency	(+++) No constraint identified from Environment Agency.	No response by the Environment Agency requested.	No response by the Environment Agency requested.	No response by the Environment Agency requested.	No response by the Environment Agency requested.
	Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +							
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -							
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --							
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++	No evidence of land instability.	No evidence of land instability. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation	No evidence of land instability.	No evidence of land instability.	No evidence of land instability. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation	No evidence of land instability. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation	No evidence of land instability. On sloping sites, specialist geotechnical advice should be sort detailing requirements for stabilisation and foundation
	Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +							
	Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out -							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
	Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --		design.			design.	design.	design.
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
	Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +							
	Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible -							
	Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --							
Amenity								
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(-) subject to the usual residential amenity considerations and the access affording appropriate noise mitigation for existing residents, the access to the site is through existing residences	(-) subject to the usual residential amenity considerations and the access affording appropriate noise mitigation for existing residents	(-) The site is proximal to the scrap yard, and so mitigation would be required, to ensure that there was no harm to potential residences. Mitigation would not be possible on the scrap yard itself. The site would look onto piles of rusting scrap metal, viewable from ground and upper levels.	(+) It is considered that there would be no nuisances which would be present at this site.	(-) the mixed use means that there could be nuisance generated	(-) the mixed use means that there could be nuisance generated	(-) subject to the usual residential amenity considerations and the access affording appropriate noise mitigation for existing residents, the access to the site is through existing residences
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -							
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --							
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding	(-) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The Scrap yard	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	<p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	properties are residential in nature.	properties are residential in nature.	has a high fence/panels surrounding the site, and their is material which is rising above the fenced areas.	properties are residential in nature.	properties are residential in nature.	properties are residential in nature.	properties are residential in nature.
I Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(-)	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
Flood Risk								
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	Yes further investigation required --	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented. FRA required. Subject to the considerations around water contamination	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented. FRA required.	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented. FRA required.	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented.	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented.	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented. FRA required.	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented. FRA required.
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++ Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development + Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site - Site not suitable for accommodating SDS -	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	(-)No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used. Indicative scheme does not show their inclusions	(++) The submitter of the site has intimated the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems." Improvements to surface water drainage to eliminate current flooding problems. This will be combined with sustainable drainage systems and rainwater collection within the new housing site".	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? *variable	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++ Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change + No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change - No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	(++) proposals are based on Passivhaus design and specification, with avoidance of overheating, and minimising of heating needs in the winter.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
	Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +							
	Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-							
	Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --							
People								
Q. 36 Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?	Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character. Proposes to improve Low Lane for access to sports pitches and sports/social complex	No impact on a use which contributes to social character. Proposes to improve Low Lane for access to sports pitches and sports/social complex	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.
	Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location +							
	Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/use and no justification or alternative provided --							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	<p>Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police +</p> <p>No – SBD principles not taken into account -</p>	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	<p>Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++</p> <p>Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +</p> <p>No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --</p>	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	<p>Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++</p> <p>Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +</p> <p>Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --</p>	No Travel Plan has been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that one could not be produced.	No Travel Plan has been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that one could not be produced.	No Travel Plan has been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that one could not be produced.	Travel Plan not required	Travel Plan not required	No Travel Plan has been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that one could not be produced.	No Travel Plan has been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that one could not be produced.
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	<p>Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++</p> <p>Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +</p> <p>Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -</p>	No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided.	No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided.	No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided.	(+) The proposal showed an initial mix of 2 and 3 bed houses and 2-bed bungalows, supported by later correspondence confirming interest from a local social housing provider.	Although there is no expectation of employment sites being allocated, there is an expectation that employment schemes will come forward outside of the allocations process.	Although there is no expectation of employment sites being allocated, there is an expectation that employment schemes will come forward outside of the allocations process.	No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided.
K Overall Rating for 'People'	<p>Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++</p> <p>Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +</p> <p>Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -</p> <p>Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --</p>	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	Proposes to upgrade low road to an adoptable standard.	(+)	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
Meeting needs								
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	The ELR (2006) and update (2010) confirmed that requirements were, for the most part, to be concentrated in the Market Towns, and that policies should be used to support the diversification of Ryedale's economic base, and the support in principle the expansion of existing established businesses. This is open countryside, not located next to an established business, and no details have been provided concerning the nature of economic development. It is considered that the allocation of this site is unlikely to meet identified needs in the ELR and its update.	The ELR (2006) and update (2010) confirmed that requirements were, for the most part, to be concentrated in the Market Towns, and that policies should be used to support the diversification of Ryedale's economic base, and the support in principle the expansion of existing established businesses. This is open countryside, not located next to an established business, and no details have been provided concerning the nature of economic development. It is considered that the allocation of this site is unlikely to meet identified needs in the ELR and its update.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.
	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +							
	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development --							
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++	(+) The submitter of the site has said that the site is capable of accommodating a range of "affordable and social housing". On site affordable homes would need to be provided in accordance with SP3.	(+) No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided in accordance with SP3.	(+) Affordable housing is expected to be provided on the site. The submitted material refers to about 35% of the properties being affordable (7-8 dwellings). On site affordable homes would need to be provided in accordance with SP3.	(+) In 2009, a scheme proposed 7no 3 bed, 3no 2 bed and 2no 2 bed elderly persons bungalows for rent with Yorkshire Housing with 12 units for sale. On site affordable homes would need to be provided in accordance with SP3. Some potential for on site delivery.	(-) Affordable housing or retail suggested by land owner. On site affordable homes would need to be provided in accordance with SP3. Limited potential for on site delivery.	(+) Affordable housing or retail suggested by land owner. On site affordable homes would need to be provided in accordance with SP3.	(+) No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided in accordance with SP3.
	Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +							
	Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA --							
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is above the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	Refers to lifetime home design principles.	2 elderly persons bungalows for rent through Yorkshire Housing in 2009 scheme. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.
	Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +							
	Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --							
	The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	(-)	(-)	(+)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +							
	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development –							
	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --							
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure								
Q45. On sites greater than 1ha	yes ++	(--) A Transport assessment is required, but has not been submitted.	(--) A Transport assessment is required, but has not been submitted.	(--) A Transport assessment is required, but has not been submitted.	Not required	Not required	(--) A Transport assessment is required, but has not been submitted.	(--) A Transport assessment is required, but has not been submitted.
	No- transport assessment required--							
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++	(--) County Highways have considered : The site has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense. The site submission was revised recently to include a strip of land to provide access/drainage to a lane to the north of the site (un-named) which would link into Low Lane which is sub-standard (see site 346), subsequent submission identifies access from East Street, which is already identified as being sub-standard as at 478	(-) County Highways have considered : The site has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense. Further information has been submitted by the site submitter to demonstrate access feasibility. The information has been submitted to the Highways Authority for consideration.	(-) The County Highways Authority considered: Existing development off low lane currently. To consider additional development in the area Low Lane would need significant improvement, widening and foot paths. The scheme proposes to improve 'to adoptable standard' the part of Low Lane up to the junction with sports facility. However, the lane would be narrower than the proposed estate roads. No legal capability has been demonstrated to do this.	(--)The County Highways Authority considered: Existing development off low lane currently. To consider additional development in the area Low Lane would need significant improvement, widening and foot paths. Site does not include a sufficient frontage to enable access of acceptable standards to be formed onto the public highway. Low lane would need to be upgraded to enable further development off Low Lane.	(--) County Highways considered: The site does not include a sufficient frontage to enable an access of acceptable standard to be formed onto the public highway. Required visibility can not be achieved onto Swinton Lane.	(+) County Highways considered: Access acceptable onto Malton Road. Impact will be determined by a traffic assessment. Would require a Travel Plan. Dependant on the proposed use, this may require additional facilities/service provision.	(--) County Highways have confirmed: No appropriate access onto the adoptable highway. The existing access to this land is too narrow to achieve an adoptable access. East Street is also narrow in nature and may need to be widened/improved if the use of this road is to be intensified.
	Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +							
	Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation –							
	Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --							
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.
	Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated –							
	Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --							
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++	There is a PROW which runs eastward to Broughton, and this is proximal and could link in - though no information has been submitted.	(+) There is a PROW which is present to the very north of the site (although not within the boundary of the site). No details have been submitted about connecting into this PROW, which links to Amotherby.	(+) The site is not proximal to any of the established PROWs in Swinton. No information has been provided concerning PROWs.	(+) The site is proximal to the established PROW in Swinton, which runs to the south of the site, along its entirety. No information has been provided concerning PROWs.	(+) The site is not proximal to any of the established PROWs in Swinton. No information has been provided concerning PROWs.	(+) The site is not proximal to any of the established PROWs in Swinton. No information has been provided concerning PROWs.	There is an established PROW to the north of the site. No information has been submitted concerning integration of this into the site.
	Proposal will not affect a PROW +							
	Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment	178	254	341	346	455	456	478
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	<p>Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++</p> <p>Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development+</p> <p>Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it --</p>	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm. The site is of a size where some form of public realm would be more achievable.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm. Proposal seeks to improve Low Lane which provides access to the sports pitches and sports centre.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm. Proposal seeks to improve Low Lane which provides access to the sports pitches and sports centre.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.
Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	<p>Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++</p> <p>Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +</p> <p>Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation --</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Yorkshire water have stated that a 150 mm sewer is on the site. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Site submitter and Yorkshire Water have noted that a 150mm sewer runs through the site. The positioning of development will need to take this into account. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Yorkshire Water have identified that there is a 225mm sewer in the northern boundary, in conjunction with other sewers. Development would either have to reflect site infrastructure, or sewer is moved. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only</p>	<p>Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only</p>

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment	178	254	341	346	455	456	478
	<p>Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --</p>	<p>villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>	<p>development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>	<p>account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>	<p>and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>	<p>and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>	<p>and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(-)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +							
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken -							
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --							
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++	(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility.	(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility.	(++) The agent has said that the landowner may be able to support wider community benefits. Proposes to improve Low Lane.	(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility. Proposes to improve Low Lane	(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility.	(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility.	(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility.
	Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +							
	Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -							
	Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --							
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++	(--) due to highway constraints	(-) due to highway constraints which have not been conclusively resolved.	(-) due to highway constraints which have not been conclusively resolved.	(--) due to highway constraints No information provided on the legal and technical capability to improve Low Lane	(--) due to highway constraints	(+)	(--) due to highway constraints
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +							
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -							
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --							
Strong Economy								
Q53. Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +							
	Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --							

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		178	254	341	346	455	456	478
Q.54 (Employment uses) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR?	Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++ Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +	NA	NA	NA	NA	(+) Site proposes mixed use, although this has not been fully identified.	(+) Site proposes mixed use, although this has not been fully identified.	NA
Q. 55 (Retail and Employment uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++ Up to 50 net jobs created + Up to 50 net jobs lost - Up to 250 net jobs lost --	NA	NA	NA	NA	Not specified.	Not specified.	NA
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++ Proposal will have a positive impact on the economy + Proposal will have a negative impact on the economy - Proposal will have a significant negative impact on the economy --	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	(+)	(+)	Not applicable

Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability

Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable) ++ Housing: Category 2 (Developable) + Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --	Employment: Category I ++ Employment: Category II + Employment: Category III -	(+) Category 2 site in 2009 in SHLAA	(-) Category 1 site in 2009 in SHLAA but access is not conclusively established.	(+) Category 2 site in 2009 in SHLAA	(-) Category 3 site in 2009 in SHLAA .	Not considered through the 2009 SHLAA.	Not considered through the 2009 SHLAA.	Not considered through the 2009 SHLAA.
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++ Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible + Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --		Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation and ability to improve Low Lane	Subject to archaeological investigation, and ability to improve Low Lane	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation
Developer Contributions									
Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++ Some contributions can be achieved + Limited contributions can be achieved - No contributions can be achieved --		(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified except for affordable housing provision.	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified, but considering 35% affordable housing provision.	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule?	Yes ++ No --		(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++ Site has some constraints and / or may not be able to support the full range of developer contributions + Site faces significant constraints and may not be able to support any developer contributions --		(+) Subject to access	(-) Highway constraints have not been satisfactorily resolved, and amenity issues remain due inability to condition the operation of the scrap yard.	(-) Highway constraints have not been satisfactorily resolved.	No response provided	No response provided	No response provided	

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566	
Stage 1 - Sift						
all sites 0.15Ha and above	0.15 Ha or greater ++	(++)0.94 ha	(++) 0.6ha	(--) 0.07ha	(++) 1.04ha	
	Less than 0.15 Ha --					
Check for conformity with Local Plan Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy (SP1)	Conforms to Local Plan Strategy Spatial Strategy (SP1) ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Does not meet Local Plan Strategy (Spatial Strategy) SP1 --					
Sites which cause significant harm to national/international nature conservation sites (species or habitat) or would involve substantial harm or loss to designated heritage assets will not be considered further	Will Not cause harm ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Will cause harm --					
Sites which fall wholly within Flood Zone 3b not considered further for built development. Where sites are partially in Flood Zone 3b, that part of the site will be not be considered further for built development	Is not within Flood Zone 3b ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Is within Flood Zone 3b --					
Stage 2 - Site Assessment						
Q1A How accessible is the site to key services and facilities	Bus stop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)		(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +				
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -				
		15 minutes walking time and over --				
	Local Shop	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)		(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +				
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -				
		15 minutes walking time and over --				
	Nearest Primary School	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(--) In Amotherby	(--) In Amotherby		(--) In Amotherby
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +				
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -				
		15 minutes walking time and over --				
	Nearest Development Limit	Up to 5 minutes walking time ++	(++)	(++)		(++)
		Up to 10 minutes walking time +				
		Up to 15 minutes walking time -				
		15 minutes walking time and over --				

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566	
Overall accessibility rating	Site has excellent accessibility ++	(++)	(++)		(++)	
	Site has good accessibility +					
	Site has variable accessibility –					
	Site has poor accessibility --					
Q2A What flood zone does the site fall within?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Flood Zone 2 +					
	Flood zone 3a –					
Q2B What vulnerability class does the site fall?	Flood Zone 1++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Flood Zone 2					Flood Zone 3a
	Less vulnerable ++					Less vulnerable+
	More vulnerable +					More vulnerable -
	Highly vulnerable -					Highly vulnerable --
Q2D Has a Flood Risk Assessment been undertaken?	yes ++	(-- SFRA complete but FRA may be required in respect of surface water	(-- SFRA complete but FRA may be required in respect of surface water	(-- SFRA complete but FRA may be required in respect of surface water	(-- SFRA complete but FRA will be required as >1ha	
	No --					
A Overall Flood Risk Assessment	Site has low overall flood risk ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)	
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which can be mitigated +					
	Site faces significant flood risk issues which could potentially be mitigated –					
	Site faces significant flood risk issues and may be inappropriate for development --					
Q3 What are the conclusions of the Highways Authorities (NYCC) and Highways England (HE) (where appropriate) initial highway assessment?	Site has no highway issues identified ++	(-- County Highways have considered : The site has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense. The site submission was revised recently to include a strip of land to provide	(-- County Highways have considered : The site has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense. The site submission was revised recently to include a strip of land to provide	(-- County Highways confirmed: Only available access from Low Lane, which is too narrow. Site does not include a sufficient frontage to enable access of acceptable standards to be formed onto the public	(-- No observations from the Highways Authorities currently. But based on 478 and 178/537/538: County Highways have confirmed: No appropriate access onto the adoptable highway. The existing access to this land is	
	Site has some highways issues identified which can be mitigated subject to further investigation +					
	Site has multiple highways issues which can be mitigated subject to further investigation -					

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
	Site has multiple highway issues which may be difficult to mitigate unless further investigation demonstrates otherwise --	land to provide access/drainage to a lane to the north of the site (unnamed) which would link into Low Lane, which is already identified as being sub-standard (see site346) . Further submissions were then received which identified a connection to East Street. However, that has already been identified as being sub-standard (see 478). The access road is indicated as being in the landowner's ownership.	land to provide access/drainage to a lane to the north of the site (unnamed) which would link into Low Lane, which is already identified as being sub-standard (see site346) . Further submissions were then received which identified a connection to East Street. However, that has already been identified as being sub-standard (see 478). The access road is indicated as being in the landowner's ownership.	formed onto the public highway.	existing access to this land is too narrow to achieve an adoptable access. East Street is also narrow in nature and may need to be widened/improved if the use of this road is to be intensified.
Biodiversity and Geodiversity					
Q4 Would the development affect a regional or local site of biodiversity (including SINC, LNR or RIGS) or affect UK, NYMNP or Ryedale Biodiversity Plan protected species	<div style="background-color: #92d050; padding: 2px;">Enhancement of feature/species possible – mitigation not required ++</div> <div style="background-color: #d9ead3; padding: 2px;">Neutral impact – no effect or effect can be fully mitigated +</div> <div style="background-color: #f4cccc; padding: 2px;">Adverse impact but mitigation possible –</div> <div style="background-color: #ff0000; padding: 2px;">Serious impact with limited means of mitigation --</div>	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species	(+) no regional or local biodiversity sites affected by development this site, and if there were to be protected species (and their habitat) present these would be considered under the appropriate legal framework afforded to such species

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
Q5 Would the development provide opportunities for the provision of green infrastructure, including linking in with existing green infrastructure/corridors	Excellent opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors ++	No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.	No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.	No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.	No information has been submitted concerning the nature of Green Infrastructure on the site. Though there is no reason to suggest that such an approach is not possible.
	Some opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors +				
	No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure/corridors, however the site has the potential to accommodate these –				
	No opportunities demonstrated to incorporate green infrastructure into the scheme and/or link to existing infrastructure corridors, however the site does not have the potential to accommodate these --				
Q6 Would the development impact on protected and unprotected trees, hedgerows and ancient woodland?	Positive impact. Enhancement of feature possible and mitigation not required ++	(+)No information has been submitted. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer made the following observations and recommendations on the 5 sites to the east of Swinton: Retain vegetation and trees subject to BS 5837:2005 survey requirements, along western and northern boundaries and supplement the eastern boundaries by the planting up of gaps with native species and providing a linear native tree/scrub strip along the whole of this boundary against open countryside. Provide plots throughout the development capable of accommodating at least one large native tree species (minimum 5% of plots) that can be viewed in the wider landscape without detriment to the enjoyment of individual buildings and property or neighbouring properties. Provide native linear plantation (minimum 4m wide) along eastern boundary to soften edge with countryside and to screen views from the east.	(+)No information has been submitted. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer made the following observations and recommendations on the 5 sites to the east of Swinton: Retain vegetation and trees subject to BS 5837:2005 survey requirements, along western and northern boundaries and supplement the eastern boundaries by the planting up of gaps with native species and providing a linear native tree/scrub strip along the whole of this boundary against open countryside. Provide plots throughout the development capable of accommodating at least one large native tree species (minimum 5% of plots) that can be viewed in the wider landscape without detriment to the enjoyment of individual buildings and property or neighbouring properties. Provide native linear plantation (minimum 4m wide) along eastern boundary to soften edge with countryside and to screen views from the east.	(+) No information has been submitted concerning the impact on trees and hedgerows. The site would be a sub division of an established field.	(+)No information has been submitted. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer made the following observations and recommendations on the 5 sites to the east of Swinton: Retain vegetation and trees subject to BS 5837:2005 survey requirements, along western and northern boundaries and supplement the eastern boundaries by the planting up of gaps with native species and providing a linear native tree/scrub strip along the whole of this boundary against open countryside. Provide plots throughout the development capable of accommodating at least one large native tree species (minimum 5% of plots) that can be viewed in the wider landscape without detriment to the enjoyment of individual buildings and property or neighbouring properties. Provide native linear plantation (minimum 4m wide) along eastern boundary to soften edge with countryside and to screen views from the east.
	Neutral impact. No effect or effect can be fully mitigated +				
	Adverse impact but mitigation possible –				
	Serious impact with limited or no means of mitigation--				

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
B Overall rating for 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity'	Positive impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and no mitigation required++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
	Neutral impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements however any effect can be fully mitigated +				
	Adverse impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements by effects are capable of some mitigation -				
	Significant impact on geodiversity or biodiversity elements and effects are unable to be satisfactorily mitigated --				
C Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting					
Q8 What is the capacity of the landscape to accommodate the site according to the Landscape Character Assessments which cover the Ryedale Area and Special Qualities Study (including views and open spaces)?	Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++	(-) The village of Swinton is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. This site is one of a collection of sites submitted to the eastern extent of the village. Here the topography is sloping downwards, gently onto the Vale. Single depth development has occurred to west of the site. The principle of 'at depth' development has occurred at Pearson's Yard. It is considered that part of the site may be appropriate for development.	(-) The village of Swinton is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. This site is one of a collection of sites submitted to the eastern extent of the village. Here the topography is sloping downwards, gently onto the Vale. Single depth development has occurred to west of the site. The principle of 'at depth' development has occurred at Pearson's Yard. It is considered that part of the site may be appropriate for development.	(-) The village of Swinton is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. This proposal represents the development of a small part of a field, on the low-lying land to the north of the village, beyond the scrap yard, which would not have any meaningful relationship to the village. Although due to the topography it is unlikely that it would harm the wider landscape.	(-) The village of Swinton is situated on land which straddles two National Character Areas, the flatter Vale of Pickering to the north of the B1257, and to the south, the undulating Howardian Hills. The Local Landscape Character recognises this change and defines it as 'Howardian Hills Foot slope' with the following characteristics: Gently, sloping terrain, strongly rural and predominantly pastoral, distinctive pattern of villages along the B1257, and panoramic views across the Vale of Pickering. The field boundaries, hedgerows, are particularly important as a landscape feature. This site is one of a collection of sites submitted to the eastern extent of the village. It is between other site submissions to the north of the existing Pearson's Yard. Here the topography is sloping downwards, gently onto the Vale. Single depth development has occurred to west of the site. The principle of 'at depth' development has occurred at Pearson's Yard. It is considered that part of the site may be appropriate for development.
	Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +				
	Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved -				
	Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --				

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment	537	538	540	566	
Q8. What impact would the site have on the nationally designated landscapes of the North York Moors National Park and Howardian Hills AONB?	<p>Site has a very low landscape sensitivity to being developed or existing landscape features are retained or enhanced. Site will not detract from landscape character ++</p> <p>Site has a low landscape sensitivity to being developed and some existing landscape features can be retained. Site is unlikely to detract from landscape character +</p> <p>Site has medium landscape sensitivity to being developed and may affect landscape features, however mitigation is possible. Site may detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved –</p> <p>Site has high landscape sensitivity to being developed and will affect landscape features with limited/no means of mitigation. Site will detract from landscape character unless satisfactory mitigation can be achieved --</p>	<p>(-) This site is the most southern site of a collection of five sites submitted on the eastern side of the village. In combination these sites extend out almost to the end of the linear strip development along the B1257. Currently development on this side is predominantly single depth, save for the Pearson's Yard. This is one of the more modest extensions within this collection of sites. It is a matter of how far out the sites project which will be a determining factor. It would be screened by existing development from the south, but it would be visible from Broughton, and the land begins to rise. Not proximal to the North York Moors and the topography of the land is flat and low-lying.</p>	<p>(-) This site is the most southern site of a collection of five sites submitted on the eastern side of the village. In combination these sites extend out almost to the end of the linear strip development along the B1257. Currently development on this side is predominantly single depth, save for the Pearson's Yard. This is one of the more modest extensions within this collection of sites. It is a matter of how far out the sites project which will be a determining factor. It would be screened by existing development from the south, but it would be visible from Broughton, and the land begins to rise. Not proximal to the North York Moors and the topography of the land is flat and low-lying.</p>	<p>(+) As this one of the northernmost sites proposed, it is considered in combination with the lower, flatter, topography that it would neither detract from the Howardian Hills AONB nor the National Park. The site is for an isolated dwelling, which would be well-screened by existing landscape features, but it would be contrary to the established form of Swinton.</p>	<p>(-) This site is the most southern site of a collection of five sites submitted on the eastern side of the village. In combination these sites extend out almost to the end of the linear strip development along the B1257. Currently development on this side is predominantly single depth, save for the Pearson's Yard. This is a substantial extension out into the open countryside. It is a matter of how far out the sites project which will be a determining factor. It would be screened by existing development from the south, but it would be visible from Broughton, and the land begins to rise. Not proximal to the North York Moors and the topography of the land is flat and low-lying.</p>
Q10 Is the site capable of utilising existing landscape features to minimise its impact or provide adequate landscape mitigation measures?	<p>Site is capable of retaining and enhancing existing landscape features ++</p> <p>Site is capable of retaining some existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is required +</p> <p>Site will not retain most existing landscape features, however landscape mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Site will not retain any existing landscape features and limited or no landscape mitigation is possible/proposed –</p>	<p>(-) The nature and scope of the development will affect the nature of landscaping required. This site is smaller than the full site of 178, and may be a less intrusive scale. Owing to the low field boundaries on the eastern side of the fields the site is highly visible when approaching from the east along the public right of way that connects Swinton and Broughton.</p>	<p>(-) The nature and scope of the development will affect the nature of landscaping required. This site is smaller than the full site of 178, and may be a less intrusive scale. Owing to the low field boundaries on the eastern side of the fields the site is highly visible when approaching from the east along the public right of way that connects Swinton and Broughton.</p>	<p>below threshold for allocation but capable of being screened.</p>	<p>(-) The site is substantial and open in scale, with some hedging, development will be visible, nature and scope of the development will influence the landscaping, and a smaller portion of the site may be less intrusive. Owing to the low field boundaries on the eastern side of the fields the site is highly visible when approaching from the east along the public right of way that connects Swinton and Broughton.</p>

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
Q11 Will the site lead to the coalescence of settlements which will impact on their character and setting?	Development within the built form of the settlement ++	(+) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. Development of this site would not exacerbate a sense of coalescence in principle, by virtue of its eastern orientation.	(+) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. Development of this site would not exacerbate a sense of coalescence in principle, by virtue of its eastern orientation.	(+) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. Development of this site would not exacerbate a sense of coalescence in principle; being to the north of Swinton.	(+) Coalescence between Amotherby and Swinton is identified as a local concern. The Local Plan Strategy states the importance of retaining the individual character of settlements. Development of this site would not exacerbate a sense of coalescence in principle, by virtue of its eastern orientation.
	Development is on the edge of a settlement which is not affected by coalescence with another settlement +				
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to coalescence with another settlement however mitigation possible –				
	Development is on the edge of the settlement and will lead to significant coalescence with another settlement and limited/no mitigation possible --				
C Overall Rating for 'Special Qualities, Landscape and Setting'	Positive impact – the proposal will retain and enhance the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement ++	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
	Neutral impact – the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement +				
	Negative impact – the proposal will have an adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement, however mitigation is possible –				
	Significant impact – the proposal will have a significant adverse impact on the special qualities, landscape and setting of the settlement and limited or no mitigation is possible --				
Culture and Heritage					
Q12 Will the site affect a designated heritage asset, either directly or indirectly through its setting?	Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++	(+) Development in this site would not impact on the setting of any designated heritage asset. There is a Listed milepost, this would not be harmed by virtue of its lack of proximity to the site.	(+) Development in this site would not impact on the setting of any designated heritage asset. There is a Listed milepost, this would not be harmed by virtue of its lack of proximity to the site.	(+) Development in this site would not impact on the setting of any designated heritage asset. There is a Listed milepost, this would not be harmed by virtue of its lack of proximity to the site.	(+) Development in this site would not impact on the setting of any designated heritage asset. There is a Listed milepost, this would not be harmed by virtue of its lack of proximity to the site.
	Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +				
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –				

Assessment		537	538	540	566
	Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --				

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
Q13 Will the site affect a non-designated heritage asset which the Council identifies as having a degree of significance that is worthy of consideration?	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>	<p>(+) The scale of this site is reduced from the 178 submission. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Site lies north of Roman road running between Malton and Hovingham. Has potential for the presence of remains of roadside activity/settlement and other features nearby recorded from aerial photography suggest potential for earlier, prehistoric remains also. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(+) The scale of the site is less than the 178 and 537 submissions. Lessening the impact. NYCC Heritage Unit advise: Site lies north of Roman road running between Malton and Hovingham. Has potential for the presence of remains of roadside activity/settlement and other features nearby recorded from aerial photography suggest potential for earlier, prehistoric remains also. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>	<p>(--) The development of this site would be separate from the existing settlement, it would not pay reference to the historic form and character of Swinton.</p>	<p>(-) The scale of the site is significant, and would be a significant projection out from the village, part of the site would have a lessened impact. Site lies north of Roman road running between Malton and Hovingham. Has potential for the presence of remains of roadside activity/settlement and other features nearby recorded from aerial photography suggest potential for earlier, prehistoric remains also. Advise geophysical survey to be followed by trial trenching to clarify the nature and significance of any archaeological remains.</p>
D Overall Rating for 'Culture and Heritage'	<p>Development would positively contribute to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset ++</p> <p>Development would not adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset +</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset, but mitigation is possible –</p> <p>Development would adversely affect the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and mitigation is not possible --</p>	<p>(+) Subject to archaeological investigation</p>	<p>(+) Subject to archaeological investigation</p>	<p>(--)</p>	<p>(-) Subject to archaeological investigation.</p>
Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy					
Q14 Is the site adopting the Energy Hierarchy of the Local Plan Strategy?	<p>Site capable and developer willing++</p> <p>Site capable but developer unwilling -</p> <p>Site not capable --</p>	<p>No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.</p>	<p>No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.</p>	<p>No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.</p>	<p>No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt the energy hierarchy, subject to feasibility and viability.</p>

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
Q15 Is the site capable of linking in or supporting off site renewable energy schemes?	Site capable linking in with off site renewable energy scheme and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.	No such schemes are available.
Q16 Can the site link in to existing heat or power sources available in the District?	Site capable of linking in with existing heat or power source and developer willing to take it forward ++	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.	No such schemes are currently available.
E Overall rating for 'Low Carbon Development and Renewable Energy'	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer willing ++	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage	No information provided at this stage
	Site capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology and developer unwilling -				
	Site not capable of incorporating low carbon and renewable energy technology --				
Sustainable Building and Waste Reduction					
Q17 Can the site accommodate higher sustainable building standards than currently required?	Site can accommodate 2 levels higher than mandatory limit ++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that a scheme could not adopt higher sustainable buildings standards, subject to feasibility and viability.
	Site can accommodate 1 level higher than mandatory limit -				
	Development cannot accommodate higher standards than mandatory level --				
Q18 Does the development contain proposals for waste reduction in both its construction and when in operation?	Proposals for waste reduction incorporated into both the construction and operation of the development++	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.
	No proposals suggested for waste reduction -				
Q. 19 Does the development contain individual/communal recycling facilities/ infrastructure?	Yes +	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.	No information has been submitted, but there is no reason to suggest that such measures could not be implemented.
	No -				
F Overall Rating for 'Sustainable Building and Waste Minimisation'	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development and developer willing ++	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.	No information submitted at this stage.
	Site capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development but developer unwilling -				
	Site not capable of incorporating sustainable building and waste minimisation into the development --				
Efficient Use of Land					
Q.20 Is the site or any part of the site considered previously developed land?	Site is over 50% to 100% Brownfield ++	0.94ha of greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	0.6ha of greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	0.07ha of greenfield land, but there is insufficient Brownfield land available.	1.04ha of Greenfield-submitter states 15-20% Brownfield land with redundant orchard and small holding/and former farm area, although these are agricultural and not considered to be Brownfield Land.
	Site is up to 50% Brownfield +				

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
Q.21 Can the site achieve an appropriate density to achieve the most efficient use of the land?	Excellent density achieved taking into account location and context ++	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 20 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 13 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could deliver c. 2 dwellings.	Assuming there are no constraints which would involve a reduced site area. Assuming a theoretical yield of 30 dwellings per hectare, with a 0.7 site development factor, the site could deliver c. 22 dwellings.
	Appropriate density achieved taking into account location and context +				
	Lower density proposed as site faces some constraints in its development -				
	Lower density necessary as site faces significant constraints in its development --				
Q.22 Would the development of the site lead to the remediation of contaminated land?	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated and will be remediated ++	No evidence of land contamination.	No evidence of land contamination.	No evidence of land contamination. However, the site is adjacent to the Scrap Yard.	No evidence of land contamination.
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and will be remediated +				
	Development is located on land which may be contaminated and no proposals for remediation have been put forward -				
	Development is located on land which is likely to be highly contaminated no proposals for remediation have been put forward --				
G Overall Rating for 'Efficient Use of Land'	Site represents very efficient use of land with mitigation to fully overcome concerns where necessary ++	(+) (+)	(+) (+)	(+) (+)	(+) (+)
	Site represents efficient use of land but further mitigation required to fully overcome concerns where necessary +				
	Site does not represent efficient use of land. Further investigation of mitigation measures to overcome concerns required -				
	Site does not represent efficient use of land and mitigation is not possible --				
Natural Resources					
Q. 23 Would the development of this site involve the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)?	No loss of best and most versatile agricultural land ++	(-) 0.94ha grades 2 and 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grades 2 and 3, and therefore there is a high possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is grazed.	(-) 0.60ha grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is grazed.	(-) 0.07ha grade 3 land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is grazed and forms part of a larger field.	(-) 1.04ha grades and 3 with 15-20% Brownfield land. There is no published data to distinguish between grades 3a and 3b. The site is classified as grade 3, and therefore there is the possibility that its development would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The land is grazed.
	Up to 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost -				
	More than 5ha of best and most versatile agricultural land lost --				
Q. 24 Would the development lead to the sterilisation of mineral resources?	Site not within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search, or Mineral Consultation Zone ++?	(-) within a mineral safeguarding area but adjacent to settlement	(-) within a mineral safeguarding area but adjacent to settlement	(++)	(-) within a mineral safeguarding area but adjacent to settlement
	Site within the buffer of a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone -?				
	Site within a mineral Preferred Area, Area of Search or Mineral Consultation Zone --				

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
Q. 25 Would the development have an adverse impact on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone?	Development is not located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone ++	(-) The northern part of the site is the Amptill Clay & Kimmeridge Clay formations. The southern part of the site is underlain by the Coralline Oolite Formation; a member of the Corallian Group principal aquifer. The whole site is overlain by drift deposits of sand & gravel and these are likely to have high permeability. There is a licensed groundwater abstraction approximately 1km to the southwest of the site and the water is for use in a food manufacturing environment which may be particularly sensitive to pollution. The geology across the northern portion of the site is not suitable for use as an aquifer due to its low permeability. However, the solid geology is overlain by permeable drift deposits and in developing the site it should be considered that any pollution entering the drift may migrate toward the principal aquifer to the south. The southern part of the site is much more vulnerable to pollution and this should be considered as part of any development at this location, particularly given the proximity of the nearby groundwater abstraction. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment will be required.	(-) The northern part of the site is the Amptill Clay & Kimmeridge Clay formations. The southern part of the site is underlain by the Coralline Oolite Formation; a member of the Corallian Group principal aquifer. The whole site is overlain by drift deposits of sand & gravel and these are likely to have high permeability. There is a licensed groundwater abstraction approximately 1km to the southwest of the site and the water is for use in a food manufacturing environment which may be particularly sensitive to pollution. The geology across the northern portion of the site is not suitable for use as an aquifer due to its low permeability. However, the solid geology is overlain by permeable drift deposits and in developing the site it should be considered that any pollution entering the drift may migrate toward the principal aquifer to the south. The southern part of the site is much more vulnerable to pollution and this should be considered as part of any development at this location, particularly given the proximity of the nearby groundwater abstraction. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment will be required.	No response by the Environment Agency requested.	No response by the Environment Agency requested.
	Development is located in a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but mitigation is possible to reduce the risk of groundwater pollution risk +				
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone but no risk assessment has been undertaken -				
	Development is located on a Principal Aquifer or in a groundwater Source Protection Zone and mitigation of the risk of groundwater pollution is not possible --				
Q. 27 Is any part of the development on suspected unstable land?	Land has no instability concerns ++	No evidence of land instability.	No evidence of land instability.	No evidence of land instability.	No evidence of land instability.
	Land potentially unstable but investigation has shown that mitigation is possible +				
	Land potentially unstable but no investigation has been carried out -				

Assessment		537	538	540	566
	Land suffers from significant instability problems and either no mitigation has been proposed or instability problems are not possible to mitigate --				
Q. 28 Will the site impact on major hazard sites or pipelines?	HSE Standing Advice states "do not advise against development" ++	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
	HSE Standing Advice states "advise against development"				

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
H Overall Rating for 'Natural Resources'	Site would not adversely affect any natural resources ++	(+) (light green)	(+) (light green)	(+) (light green)	(+) (light green)
	Site would not have any significant adverse effect on natural resources +				
	Site would have an adverse effect on natural resources but mitigation is possible -				
	Site would have a significant adverse effect on natural resources and limited/no mitigation is possible --				
Amenity					
Q. 29 Is the development in an area where noise, light, dust or smell is likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to generate noise, light or dust which will affect existing users?	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(-) subject to the usual residential amenity considerations and the access affording appropriate noise mitigation for existing residents, the access to the site is through existing residences	(-) subject to the usual residential amenity considerations and the access affording appropriate noise mitigation for existing residents, the access to the site is through existing residences	(-- The site is adjacent to the scrap yard. Mitigation will be challenging to deal with the impacts of noise, poor outlook and other matters, the house could be occupied by any individual in the future.	(-) subject to the usual residential amenity considerations and the access affording appropriate noise mitigation for existing residents, the access to the site is through existing residences
	The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -				
	The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --				
Q. 30 Is the development in an area where other factors are likely to cause nuisance to new users or is the development likely to	The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding	(-- The site is adjacent to the scrap yard. Which contains relatively high boundary fences and piles of scrap metal. These mean the	(+) These types of residential amenity issues can be considered through siting, orientation and window treatments. The surrounding

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
generate forms of nuisance which may affect the amenity of existing users? These may include issues such as privacy, lack of sunlight overbearing effects.	<p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	properties are residential in nature.	properties are residential in nature.	property has unusually high boundary treatment and an adverse outlook. Particularly from first floor windows.	properties are residential in nature.
Overall Rating for 'Amenity'	<p>The development is unlikely to cause nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses are unlikely to cause nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site +</p> <p>The development may cause some nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses may cause some nuisance to the proposed occupants of the site. Mitigation of some of this nuisance is possible -</p> <p>The development will cause significant nuisance to existing neighbouring uses or neighbouring uses will cause significant nuisance to the proposed occupants of this site. There is limited or no means of mitigation of this nuisance --</p>	(-)	(-)	(--)	(-)

Assessment		537	538	540	566
Flood Risk					
Q. 31 Is the site potentially affected by groundwater flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
Q. 32 Is the site potentially affected by surface water flooding and is this site considered to be within a critical drainage area?	Yes further investigation required --	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented. subject to the considerations around water contamination	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented. subject to the considerations around water contamination	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented.	(++) Yes, the site is defined as an area susceptible to surface water flooding, but not a critical drainage area. The Environment Agency require no increase in surface run off from the site. Expect use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to be implemented. FRA required.
Q. 33 Is the site potentially affected by sewer flooding?	No ++ Yes further investigation required --	(++)	(++)	(++)	(++)
Q. 34 Have Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDS) been proposed as part of the development?	Site capable of accommodating SDS and have been proposed as part of the development ++ Site capable of accommodating SDS though no information on whether SDS proposed as part of the development + Site capable of accommodating SDS however SDS not being proposed on site - Site not suitable for accommodating SDS -	No mention of SDS but submitted information to demonstrate that this site can demonstrate no pressure on existing drainage pressure in Swinton.	No mention of SDS but submitted information to demonstrate that this site can demonstrate no pressure on existing drainage pressure in Swinton.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.
Q. 35 What other measures* have been considered which ensure the development is resilient to climate change? *variable	Multiple additional measures proposed which build in resilience to climate change ++ Single additional measure proposed to build in resilience to climate change + No information provided on measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change - No measures proposed to build in resilience to climate change --	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.	No information has been submitted concerning the application of other measures to increase resilience to climate change, although there is no reason to suggest that such elements could not be used.

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
J Overall Rating for 'Flood Risk'	No flood risk associated with the site ++	(+)	(+)	(+)	(+)
	Limited flood risk associated with the site which can be fully mitigated +				
	Site affected by a number of flood risk issues, however mitigation possible-				
	Site affected by significant flood risk issues and limited mitigation possible --				
People					
Q. 36 Would the development of the site lead to the loss of an existing use which contributes to the social character and distinctiveness of the settlement?	Development incorporates existing use(s), as part of the overall scheme ++	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.	No impact on a use which contributes to social character.
	Development proposes relocation of use to suitable alternative location +				
	Development will result in the loss of a valued facility/use and no justification or alternative provided --				

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
Q. 37 Will the site incorporate the principles of Secured By Design, reducing the potential for crime and discouraging anti-social behaviour?	Yes – SBD principles taken into account or will be taken into account following liaison with North Yorkshire police +	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.	No information has been submitted concerning Secured by Design principles, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated into a scheme, subject to any village design context.
	No – SBD principles not taken into account -				
Q. 38 Does the design of the development encourage people to walk and cycle rather than travel by car?	Cycleways and footpaths effectively integrated into the development encouraging walking and cycling ++	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.	No information has been submitted concerning the provision of footpaths and cycle routes, but there is no reason to suggest that they could not be incorporated within the context of the development.
	Some cycleways and/or footpaths shown encouraging walking and cycling +				
	No cycleways and footpaths indicated as part of this development --				
Q. 39 For sites over 1ha or over 80 houses- Has a Travel Plan been produced which assesses alternative options and initiatives?	Travel Plan undertaken and clear implementable initiatives for promoting modal shift set out ++	Travel Plan not required	Travel Plan not required	Travel Plan not required	No Travel Plan has been submitted but there is no reason to suggest that one could not be produced.
	Travel Plan undertaken and some initiatives identified for promoting modal shift +				
	Travel Plan undertaken which identifies limited opportunities for modal shift or Travel Plan not undertaken --				
Q. 40 Will the proposed development attract a balanced living and/or working population, reducing inequality of opportunity?	Development proposed is clearly designed to attract a balanced living and/or working community ++	No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided.	No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided.	This is a site which proposes a dwelling.	No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided.
	Development takes into account the need to attract a balanced and/or working community +				
	Development takes no account of the need to attract a balanced living and/or working community -				
K Overall Rating for 'People'	Development actively planned to encourage the development of sustainable communities ++	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.	No information submitted.
	Development has taken into account the need to develop sustainable communities +				
	Development has little regard to the need to develop sustainable communities -				
	Development has no regard for the need to develop sustainable communities --				

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
Meeting needs					
Q.41 Does the type and mix of development proposed meet the needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Employment Land Review Update 2010 (ELR), Ryedale Retail Capacity Studies (RRCS) and Malton Town Centre Strategy?	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.	No details have been provided concerning the number, type and mix of dwellings to be provided. The 2011 SHMA denotes this settlement as being in the 'Ampleforth etc.' of Ryedale's Housing Market Sub Area. In 2011 this area has a current housing need of 76 households, with a newly arising need, yearly of 26. This equates to a gross annual housing need of 38 dwellings.
	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +				
	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -				
	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs will be met --				
Q. 42 What level and type of affordable housing is proposed?	Development offers appropriate level and type of affordable housing which meets the needs as set out in the SHMA ++	(+)No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided in accordance with SP3.	(-)No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided in accordance with SP3. Limited potential for on site delivery.	Site proposed as a single dwelling scheme. Site could deliver 2 units, for which there would be no on-site affordable housing.	(+) No details have been provided concerning the nature of the type of dwellings that are proposed. On site affordable homes would need to be provided in accordance with SP3.
	Development offers some affordable housing which meets some of the need as set out in the SHMA +				
	Development does not offer the appropriate level and type of affordable housing or does not meet the need for affordable housing as set out in the SHMA -				
	The development makes no provision for affordable housing --				
Q. 43 What provision has been made for Ryedale's elderly population?	Development addresses and meets the needs of Ryedale's elderly population ++	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	Two dwelling scheme. The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.	No extra-care units are proposed within the Service Villages, in line with the County Council's delivery strategy for meeting the needs of the Elderly. The site is below the threshold for the delivery of bungalows on site (as per SP4 of the LPS). The Local Plan Strategy outlines the support for delivery of Lifetime Homes standards.
	Development takes into account and meets some of the needs of Ryedale's elderly population +				
	Development does not address the needs of Ryedale's elderly population -				
	The development makes no provision for the needs of Ryedale's elderly population --				

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
L Overall Rating for 'Meeting Needs'	Proposal clearly identifies what the needs are and how they will be met by the development ++	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
	Proposal identifies what the needs are and how some needs will be met by the development +				
	Proposal either does not identify what the needs are or how any needs are or how any needs will be met by the development -				
	No assessment is undertaken of what the needs are and whether any needs --				
Community Facilities, utilities and Infrastructure					
Q45. On sites greater than 1ha	yes ++	Not required	Not required	Not required	(-- A Transport assessment is required, but has not been submitted.
	No- transport assessment required--				
Q. 46 Is highway mitigation required as part of the development and what is the impact of the development on the highway network following mitigation?	No mitigation required or no impact on the highway following mitigation ++	(-- County Highways have considered : The site has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense. The site submission was revised recently to include a strip of land to provide access/drainage to a lane to the north of the site (unnamed) which would link into Low Lane which is sub-standard (see site 346), subsequent submission identifies access from East Street, which is already identified as being sub-standard as at 478	(-- County Highways have considered : The site has no direct connection/frontage to a highway maintainable at the public expense. The site submission was revised recently to include a strip of land to provide access/drainage to a lane to the north of the site (unnamed) which would link into Low Lane which is sub-standard (see site 346), subsequent submission identifies access from East Street, which is already identified as being sub-standard as at 478		(-- No observations from the Highways Authorities currently. But based on 478 and 178/537/538: County Highways have confirmed: No appropriate access onto the adoptable highway. The existing access to this land is too narrow to achieve an adoptable access. East Street is also narrow in nature and may need to be widened/improved if the use of this road is to be intensified.
	Mitigation required but no unacceptable impact following mitigation +				
	Mitigation required and development would have a significant impact though not unacceptable impact after mitigation -				
	Mitigation required and development would still have an unacceptable impact following mitigation --				
Q. 47 Can the site accommodate adequate parking and servicing facilities?	Site meets highway guidelines for parking and servicing ++	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.	No details have been submitted or considered by the Highways Authority concerning parking and servicing.
	Site does not currently meet parking and/or servicing requirements. However these issues can potentially be overcome or mitigated -				
	Site does not meet highway requirements for parking and/or servicing and the issues identified are difficult/not practically possible to overcome --				
Q. 48 Will the proposal provide, enable or improve access to public rights of way (PROW)?	Proposal will create new PROW or integrate existing PROW into the development ++	There is a PROW which runs eastward to Broughton, and this is proximal and could link in -though no information has been submitted.	There is a PROW which runs eastward to Broughton, and this is proximal and could link in -though no information has been submitted.	(+) The site is not proximal to any of the established PROWs in Swinton. No information has been provided concerning PROWs.	There is an established PROW to the south of the site. No information has been submitted concerning integration of this into the site.
	Proposal will not affect a PROW +				
	Proposal would involve the diversion or loss of a PROW --				

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
Q. 49 Does the proposal involve new public realm or enhancements to the existing public realm as part of its development?	Proposal will create high quality new public realm or significantly enhance existing public realm as part of its development ++	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.	No proposals have been submitted concerning the development of new public realm.	The submitter of site seeks to deliver allotments on the more distanced part of the site, 1 allotment per dwelling. Access provided by existing bridleway/footpath.
	Proposal will create some new public realm or partially enhance existing public realm as part of its development+				
	Though capable of incorporating new or enhancing existing public realm, the proposal makes no provision for it --				
Q. 50 What is the capacity of existing utilities and infrastructure to cope with impact of the development?	Site has limited or no adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be fully mitigated ++	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary education: additional capacity will be required. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only	Gas: Potential requirement for reinforcement, but this depends on sites. Electricity: no capacity issue currently identified. Primary education: additional capacity required at Amotherby School. Secondary Education: additional capacity will be required. Existing main sewer located to the south of the site. There are no immediate concerns regarding receiving waste water. Growth within the catchment will be taken into account in the design of the works but clearly new development should be phased to allow YW to provide the necessary infrastructure. We have no reports of internal sewer
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be satisfactorily mitigated +				
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation --				

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
	<p>Site has high adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --</p>	<p>and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>	<p>and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>		<p>reports of internal sewer flooding in any of the villages and domestic foul water only may drain to public sewer. Surface water should be disposed of elsewhere and in line with the surface water drainage hierarchy i.e. ideally to SuDs and failing that to watercourse. There are no issues with regard to water supply although local minor reinforcements could be required, depending on the size and precise location of any development.</p>

Assessment		537	538	540	566
Q. 51 What is the impact on Waste Water Treatment Works?	Further than 400m from the boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works ++	(++)	(++)		(++)
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken and Yorkshire Water No Objection +				
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact not undertaken -				
	Within 400m of boundary of a Waste Water Treatment Works. Investigation into impact undertaken Yorkshire Water consulted and likely to object --				
Q. 52 Would the development on its own, have an impact on an existing community facility and has mitigation of this impact been proposed as part of the development?	Site has no adverse impact on community facilities or where there is an adverse impact this is fully mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities ++	(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility.	(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility.		(++) The site on its own would not have a direct impact on an existing community facility.
	Site does not have a significant adverse impact on community facilities or where there is a significant adverse impact this is mitigated through the provision of new, expanded or alternative facilities +				
	Site has an adverse impact on community facilities and limited mitigation is indicated -				
	Site has a significant adverse impact on community facilities and no mitigation is indicated --				
M Overall Rating for 'Community facilities, Utilities and Infrastructure'	Site has limited or no adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has a adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this can be fully mitigated ++	(--)	(--)		(--)
	Site has limited to medium adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure but can be satisfactorily accommodated. Or site has an adverse impact but through the provision of new infrastructure as proposed by the site, this impact can be satisfactorily mitigated +				
	Site has medium to high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with some mitigation -				
	Site has high adverse impact on community facilities, utilities and infrastructure and can only be satisfactorily accommodated with significant mitigation --				
Strong Economy					
Q53. Will the site promote the viability and vitality of the Principal Town or Local Service Centre?	Proposal will support and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, encouraging new investment ++	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Proposal will support the vitality and viability of the town centre in retaining key services and facilities +				
	Proposal could adversely harm the viability and vitality of the town centre leading to decline --				

Amotherby and Swinton - Full Site Selection Methodology

Assessment		537	538	540	566
Q.54 (Employment uses) Will the mix of uses proposed by the development assist in diversifying the economy as set out in the ELR?	Mix of uses proposed will diversify the economy as set out in the ELR ++	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Mix of uses proposed will not diversify the economy but will support existing employment sectors in Ryedale +				
Q. 55 (Retail and Employment uses) Does the proposal involve the creation of net additional or net loss of jobs in Ryedale?	Up to 250 net jobs created ++	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Up to 50 net jobs created +				
	Up to 50 net jobs lost -				
	Up to 250 net jobs lost --				
N Overall rating for 'Strong Economy'	Proposal will have a significant positive impact on the economy ++	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
	Proposal will have a positive impact on the economy +				
	Proposal will have a negative impact on the economy -				
	Proposal will have a significant negative impact on the economy --				
Stage 3 - Deliverability / Developability					
Q56. How does the site perform against the SHLAA Update (housing), ELR Update (employment) and RRCS (retail) in terms of its ability to come forward and its suitability for development?	Housing: Category 1 (Deliverable)++	Employment: Category I ++	(+)Category 2 site in 2009 in SHLAA	(+)Category 2 site in 2009 in SHLAA	Not considered through the 2009 SHLAA.
	Housing: Category 2 (Developable) +	Employment: Category II +			
	Housing: Category 3 (Not Currently Developable) --	Employment: Category III -			
Q57. Are there any other legal or physical constraints which may affect the ability of the site to come forward?	No constraints identified ++	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation	Subject to archaeological investigation
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution possible +				
	Constraint(s) identified but resolution is uncertain --				
Developer Contributions					
Q58 Will the development be capable of meeting the usual range of site-specific s106 requirements?	Normal range of contributions can be achieved ++	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(+) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	Unknown
	Some contributions can be achieved +				
	Limited contributions can be achieved -				
	No contributions can be achieved --				
Q. 59 Can the development support the requirements of the CIL charging schedule?	Yes ++	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	(++) Continue to consider site in light of LPS requirements. No details of contributions specified.	Unknown
	No --				
O Overall Deliverability / Developability Rating	Site is able to come forward without impairment and is able to provide a normal range of contributions ++	(+)	(+)	(+)	No response provided
	Site has some constraints and / or may not be able to support the full range of developer contributions +				
	Site faces significant constraints and may not be able to support any developer contributions --				